DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 119 328 EA 007 964

AUTHOR	Miklos, E.
TITLE	The Training of School Administrators and Supervisors.
INSTITUTION	Alberta Univ., Edmonton. Dept. of Educational Administration.
SPONS AGENCY	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Paris (France). Dept. of Higher Education and Training of Educational Personnel.
PUB DATE	May 74
NOTE	146p.; The 15 tables may reproduce poorly in hard copy due to small print size of the originals
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Organization; *Administrative Personnel; *Administrator Education; *Administrator Qualifications; Administrator Role; Administrator Selection; Bibliographies; Educational Administration; Higher Education

ABSTRACT

This study develops an overview of current practices, problems, and trends in the preparation of school administrators in various countries. Related aspects of preparation, such as administrator recruitment and selection, are also considered. Data for the study were gathered through examination of documentary materials related to the duties and training of educational administrators. Since no sampling procedures were used, generalizations presented in the report do not relate to a specified population of educational systems, and no inferences can be made about the relative distribution of specific practices. Following a brief introductory chapter, chapter 2 examines the organizational structure of educational systems in various countries. Chapter 3 outlines some categories of educational administrators, their major functions, and the distribution of personnel in selected educational systems. Chapter 4 discusses policies and practices governing the qualifications of administrative personnel. Chapter 5 examines approaches to the preservice and inservice training of administrators. Chapter 6 considers various issues related to the training of administrators, and chapter 7 presents a number of proposals and recommendations for future consideration. (Author/JG)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED119328

THE TRAINING OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AND SUPERVISORS

A Report Prepared
for the
Department of Higher Education and Training
of Educational Personnel
of the
United Nations Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

by

E. Miklos

The University of Alberta

Edmonton, Canada

May, 1974

EA 007 964

PREFACE

This report is the outcome of a study which the Department of Educational Administration of the University of Alberta agreed to conduct for the Department of Higher Education and Training of Educational Personnel of Unesco in August, 1973. The purpose of the study was to develop an overview of current practices, problems and trends in the preparation of school administrators in various countries. Because this particular field had not received similar attention at an international level previously, the project proved to be challenging but also highly stimulating. I am grateful to Unesco and to the University of Alberta for having provided me with the opportunity to carry out the study.

The data required could not have been obtained without the assistance of various members of the Department of Higher Education and Training of Educational Personnel; the continuing interest of the staff in the study proved to be most helpful. Special mention must also be made of the Unesco Regional Offices of Education in Bangkok, Beirut, Dakar and Santiago as well as of the International Bureau of Education in Geneva for providing essential documents. The assistance of these and other agencies and of ministries or departments of education in various countries is gratefully acknowledged.

Members of the academic staff, graduate students and secretarial staff in the Department of Educational Administration assisted both directly and indirectly in the conduct of the study and with the preparation of this report; their contributions to the project are greatly appreciated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

List of Tables v

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Problem and Method 2

Definitions and Limitations 3

Overview of the Report 5

II. ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION OF EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS 6

Types of Structures 6

Summary 25

III. CATEGORIES AND FUNCTIONS OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL 28

Administrative Functions at Different Levels 30

Number of Administrative Personnel 41

Summary 48

IV. APPOINTMENT AND CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS 50

Requirements for Appointment 50

Certification of Administrators 55

Recruitment and Selection Practices 61

Summary 64

V. PRE-SERVICE AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMS 66

Ministry Sponsored or Supported Programs 67

Special Training Centers 72

Chapter Page

International Programs 79

University Programs 83

Summary 87

VI. PROBLEMS AND ISSUES IN ADMINISTRATOR PREPARATION 89

Need for Training 89

Some Issues in Administrator Training 97

Summary 108

VII. DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS 109

Proposals and Recommendations 109

Conclusion 126

BIBLIOGRAPHY 129

DOCUMENTS USED IN PREPARATION OF REPORT 130

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON ADMINISTRATOR PREPARATION 139

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Characteristics of Six Types of Administrative Structures and Representative Countries for Each Type 8

2. Functions of National and Regional/Local Education Agencies in Selected Countries 10

3. Functions of National, Regional and Local Agencies in Selected Countries 13

4. Functions of National, Regional, Sub-Regional and Local Agencies in Selected Countries 17

5. Functions and Activities of National Agencies in Countries Where Primary Authority for Education is at State Level ... 20

6. Functions of Primary Authority, Local Administrative Units and Coordination Mechanism in Three Selected Countries 22

7. Categorization of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel by System Level 29

8. Regulatory, Advisory, and Other Activities of Inspectors 32

9. Educational, Administrative, and Social Functions of Elementary Supervisors in Paraguay 34

10. Comparison of Role of District Education Officer in India and District Superintendent in Saskatchewan, Canada 37

11. Requirements for Appointment as Principal or Vice-Principal in Selected Education Systems 51

12. Requirements for Appointment as Education Officer in Selected Education Systems 54

13. Requirements for Administrator's Certificates in Liberia 56

14. Requirements for Administrator's Certificates in New Brunswick, Canada 58

15. Distribution of Numbers of States by Minimum Academic Requirements for Administrative Certificates (United States of America) 60

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The importance of the quality of personnel who work in the field of education to the success of educational activities is no longer considered to be problematic. Current drives in various countries to raise the level of pre-service training of teachers, to reduce the number of underqualified teachers and to provide in-service training serve as evidence of the importance which is attached to having professional teachers in schools. It is generally accepted that various types of development programs require the skills of such trained personnel as social workers, psychologists, and health services specialists. Until recently one category of personnel frequently has been overlooked in moves toward requiring more specialized preparation for the performance of particular functions: the category is that which includes supervisors and administrators. There appears to have been an implicit assumption that administrators and supervisors require minimal specialized preparation and that the training required is not a matter for study or debate. This report is one indication that the assumption is being questioned.

The substance of this report concerns current policies, provisions, and practices governing the preparation of personnel for administrative and supervisory functions in education. Related aspects of preparation such as recruitment and selection were also included in the study on which this report is based. The purpose of the study was to review current practices in this area and to identify some issues which might become the subject of immediate action as well as to suggest problems for further study.

PROBLEM AND METHOD

The purpose or the problem of the study can best be defined by stating some of the general questions which guided the collection of information. These are as follows:

1. What is the nature of the organizational and administrative structures within which administrative and supervisory personnel carry out their functions?
2. What are the main categories of administrative and supervisory personnel? What functions are associated with each general category?
3. What are the current policies and practices with respect to the recruitment, selection, and appointment of administrators and supervisors?
4. What are some of the current approaches to the pre-service and in-service training of administrators and supervisors?
5. What major issues surround the development of preparation programs?

During the conduct of the study these general questions raised numerous more specific ones which were used to make decisions about what content or data to include in the report. The study attempted to provide some tentative answers to these questions and to work toward some recommendations for action and for further research.

The main method of the study consisted of an examination of available documentary materials which related to the questions listed above and the compilation of information in a meaningful way. Documents which were reviewed ranged from formal statements of policies and regulations to impressionistic reports and personal communications. In an attempt to increase the readability of the report, specific references and quotations have been kept to a minimum; however, without exception, the sources of information are the documents which are listed in the designated section of the bibliography.

DEFINITIONS AND LIMITATIONS

This report is not intended to be a technical document; few, if any, of the terms used carry highly precise definitions. For example, the terms administrator and supervisor are used to describe a general category or categories of personnel in education. At certain times only one term such as administrator may be used even when supervisor could also have been added; the mention of only one does not mean that the other was intentionally excluded. The term educational system is used to refer to the total structure of education within a country or a region of that country; system does not have any technical definition. Hopefully, these and other terms can be used to communicate about the subject of this report without too much distortion. A general guide for the reader to follow would be to assume that the more general definition of a term is to be understood rather than a more narrow, precise or technical definition.

The difficulty of defining terms becomes one of the limitations of this report. In view of the approach adopted for the study and the constraints under which it was conducted, there are several other limitations which should be mentioned. One of these has its source in the variability of the types of documents which were available for the study; these documents were not comparable across countries. Consequently, what appear to be variations in practice may be due at least in part to variations in the form in which the information was available; it does not necessarily mean that practices varied or that there were no policies in specific areas.

A second limitation is one which is characteristic of all studies based on the analysis of documentary materials. There is no assurance that practice is actually in accord with the stated policies; furthermore, any general statement can subsume considerable variations in practice. Compiling information from these materials results in further generalizations which do not reveal interesting and important variations. There is a further complicating factor in that translation of documents from one language to another opens the door to the misinterpretations which present a hazard to all studies that attempt to cross language and cultural boundaries.

Since no sampling procedures were used, the generalizations presented in this report do not relate to a specified population of educational systems. The policies and practices described are not representative of any group of systems; they are only indications of the variety of approaches which have been adopted in different countries. No inferences can or should be made about the relative distribution of those practices. A totally different design for a study would be required in order to obtain an indication of the numbers of educational systems which engage in specific practices with what frequencies and with what consequences.

OVERVIEW OF THE REPORT

This report is organized into five chapters exclusive of this introduction; the chapters follow the sequence and the subject of the questions which guided the conduct of the study. The chapter which follows deals with the organizational structure of educational systems because this appeared to be basic to a discussion of the functions and training of administrative personnel. In the third chapter is presented an outline of some categories of administrators and supervisors, their major functions and the distribution of personnel in selected systems. The fourth chapter is concerned with some of the policies and practices governing the qualifications of those appointed to administrative posts while the fifth chapter examines some of the approaches to the pre-service and in-service training of administrators and supervisors. Some of the issues which are associated with the training of administrators are discussed in the sixth chapter. The report concludes with some proposals for consideration by those who hold responsibility for administrator training or for whom this is an area of scholarly study.

CHAPTER II

AMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION OF EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS

The administrative structures of educational systems in different countries are shaped to a large extent by cultural, social, political and economic factors. In some countries the administrative and organizational structure is firmly grounded in tradition and in clearly established relationships between education and the other institutions of the society; in other countries, the formal structure of education may be in the process of being reshaped as societies search for institutions which will enable them to achieve emerging aspirations. The result of these differences among countries is that there are also great variations in the organizational structures which have been developed for the purpose of providing educational services. Any attempt to categorize educational systems on the basis of administrative and organizational structures is likely to result in oversimplification and in somewhat arbitrary decisions about placement. Nevertheless, some attempt to compare and contrast structures must be made since it is basic to a discussion of the roles and preparation of administrative personnel.

TYPES OF STRUCTURES

Categorizations and classifications of educational systems can be developed from different bases; classifications derived from one base are not likely to be equivalent to those derived from another. Congruence of classifications is not as important as is selecting bases for the classification which are relevant to the purposes for which the classification will be used. Since the purpose of the classification in this report is to facilitate a discussion of administrators and supervisors in different systems it seems appropriate to propose a classification based on the locus of major responsibility for education and on the number of administrative levels. Needless to say, it would be hazardous to draw conclusions about the actual operation of these systems simply from the categorizations without additional data.

Educational systems can be grouped into two broad types according to whether education is the responsibility of a national government or whether it is the responsibility of individual states within a federal political structure. Those systems in which it is a responsibility of the national government can be subdivided into at least four categories according to the number of levels in the administrative structure of the system. In some countries education is administered by a national ministry without any additional, clearly distinct levels above that of the school; in others there may be structures at regional levels, at regional and local levels, or at regional, sub-regional, and local levels. Countries in which education is a state responsibility may be subdivided into two main groups: those in which there is also a structure at the national or federal level and those in which there is none. These six types are presented in Table 1 with an outline of the characteristics of each type and a list of representative countries. In federal systems where education is a state (provincial) responsibility, each individual state or province could be classified in the same way as are countries in which education is a national responsibility; however, such a step

TABLE 1

CHARACTERISTICS OF SIX TYPES OF ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURES AND REPRESENTATIVE COUNTRIES FOR EACH TYPE

	Type	Characteristics	Representative Countries
A	National	National ministry is only administrative level above school level.	Gambia, Kuwait, Monaco, Sierra Leone, Singapore
B	National-Regional OR National-Local	National responsibilities in education discharged through a ministry and authorities at local or regional levels.	Cyprus, England, France, Iran, Ireland, Kenya, New Zealand, Republic of Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Scotland, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic, Panama
C	National-Regional -Local	Administrative structure includes a national ministry of education and two additional administrative levels.	Austria, Democratic Republic of the Sudan, Finland, Japan, Korea, Republic of Vietnam, Uganda, Brazil
D	National-Regional-Sub-Regional-Local	Administrative structure includes a national ministry of education and three or more additional administrative levels.	Cuba, Italy, Thailand, Peru
E	State-National OR State-Local-National	Authority and responsibility for education resides with states. Specific agency or structure at national or federal level; varying degrees of national involvement.	Australia, India, Nigeria, United States
F	State-Local	Authority and responsibility for education reside with states or provinces; structure for inter-state coordination.	Canada, Federal Republic of Germany, Switzerland

would make the present analysis unnecessarily complex.

Type A: National

In the National type of administrative structure, schools are operated directly by a ministry of education without intervening administrative levels of any significance. Decisions in areas such as finance, curriculum, and school constructions are made at the central level. Teachers are employed by the ministry and a staff of inspectors carries out the function of providing general supervision over education.

Type B: National-Regional or National-Local

The National-Regional or National-Local type is basically a two-level structure even though there may also be provisions for some additional administrative organization at the individual school level. In this type of structure there is a national ministry or department of education and either regional or local authorities which may or may not have legislative powers. Table 2 sets out some representative countries together with a brief summary of some of the functions and activities at each of the two levels.

An examination of Table 2 reveals that the national ministries or departments are involved in the general area of educational policy development and in the control and general supervision of the educational system. Although there are some variations, national ministries tend to be involved in controlling finance, teacher training, school construction, curriculum, and in setting minimum standards. The local and regional levels are involved in executing and implementing general policy but may have also have additional specific responsibilities. In England, the

TABLE 2

FUNCTIONS OF NATIONAL AND REGIONAL/LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES IN SELECTED COUNTRIES

Country	National Agency and Functions	Regional/Local Agency and Functions
England	Department of Education and Science - sets minimum standards - controls rate, nature and cost of educational building - controls training and supply of teachers - supports educational research	Local Education Authorities (101 elected councils of counties, metropolitan districts and boroughs) - build schools - employ teachers - employ local inspectors - provide equipment and materials
Syrian Arab Republic	Ministry of Education - plans, supervises and controls education - controls teacher training - supervises examinations - determines curricula	Provincial Councils - establish and administer elementary and secondary schools - maintain facilities - enforce compulsory education - supervise the education process - carry out training sessions for teachers
Iran	Ministry of Education - prepares educational plans for kindergarten to secondary levels - approves budgets - controls teacher training	Regional Education Councils (174 elected councils) - prepare budgets and supervise expenditures - administer education at the regional level

(continued)

TABLE 2 (continued)

FUNCTIONS OF NATIONAL AND REGIONAL/LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES IN SELECTED COUNTRIES

Country	National Agency and Functions	Regional/Local Agency and Functions
New Zealand	Department of Education - determines educational policy - distributes funds - ensures maintenance of standards - devises curricula and authorizes courses of instruction - determines staffing provisions - recruits and trains teachers - organizes and supervises the planning and construction of buildings	Education Boards (10 boards elected by the school committees within board districts) - establish school districts - establish, maintain and control schools - distribute grants - employ teachers - advise the Department on educational needs (Committees at the school level are concerned primarily with maintenance of and use of facilities)
France	Ministry of Education - decides organization of education and conditions of schooling - sets curricula and examinations - plans and coordinates education - inspects staff and schools - controls teacher training	Regional Administration (25 Academy Rectors) - act for the Minister of National Education - execute laws and regulations - responsible for schools in the academy - organizes examinations and appoints examining boards - supervises teaching staff and academy inspectors
Saudi Arabia	Ministry of Education - plans educational policy, budgets and curricula - controls teacher training - develops educational programs	Regional Directorates (19) - implement policies in matters of school buildings, admission of students, supervision of teachers and headmasters - provide information to the Ministry

local authorities build schools, employ teachers and other professional personnel, and provide equipment and materials; similar functions are performed by the education boards in New Zealand. In the Syrian Arab Republic, Iran, France and Saudi Arabia, the regional or provincial structures are responsible for the administration of schools in their areas. This can include functions such as organizing examinations at the academy level in France, preparing budgets and supervising expenditures in Iran, and carrying out training sessions for teachers in the Syrian Arab Republic.

Type C: National-Regional-Local

Table 3 presents information about Japan, Finland and the Republic of Vietnam, each of which has a three-level administrative structure. The levels below the Ministry in Japan are the Prefectural and Municipal Boards of Education, in Finland they are Country Governments and Municipal School Boards, while in Vietnam they consist of five Regional Education Services and fifty-one Provincial Education Services.

The ministries in the three countries exercise the general functions which are to be expected at this level; these are not too different from those outlined for ministries in the previous type. In Finland, the agency through which the Ministry discharges its functions in primary and secondary education is the National Board of Education. The Board directs, supervises and controls primary and secondary schools, teacher training institutes, public libraries and non-formal education. The Japanese Ministry of Education administers all governmental services relating to education, science, culture and religion. Similarly, the

TABLE 3

FUNCTIONS OF NATIONAL, REGIONAL AND LOCAL AGENCIES IN SELECTED COUNTRIES

Country	National Level	Regional Level	Local Level
Japan	Ministry of Education - administers governmental services relating to education, science, culture and religion	Prefectural Boards of Education - provide administrative and professional assistance to municipal boards - require municipal boards to submit reports - appoint, pay salaries to and dismiss teachers - issue certificates for teachers - supervise establishment and revision of school districts	Municipal Boards of Education - establish and administer schools - appoint, transfer and discipline teachers - conduct in-service training for teachers - administer entrance, transfer and discharge of students
Finland	Ministry of Education National Board of Education - directs, supervises and controls primary and secondary schools, teacher training institutes, public libraries and voluntary non-formal education	County Governments - responsible for primary schools, folk high schools, civic and workers' institutes and public libraries - prepare county-level educational plans	Municipal School Boards - direct and supervise the municipal school system - prepare and submit National Board municipal educational programs

(continued)

TABLE 3 (continued)

FUNCTIONS OF NATIONAL, REGIONAL AND LOCAL AGENCIES IN SELECTED COUNTRIES

Country	National Level	Regional Level	Local Level
Republic of Vietnam	Ministry of Culture, Education and Youth	Regional Education Services (5)	Provincial Education Services (51)
	- plans educational development - provides for research - provides for training of personnel - evaluates management of education	- promote development of regional education - provide Ministry with data for educational planning - supervise primary and secondary schools - organize examinations	- propose projects for educational expansion - supervise elementary and secondary schools - manage expenditures - supervise personnel

Ministry of Culture, Education and Youth in Vietnam plans educational development, provides for the training of personnel and evaluates the management of education.

The Prefectural and Municipal Boards of Education in Japan share certain responsibilities; however, a discussion of these is beyond the scope of this report. Prefectural Boards are involved in providing administrative and professional assistance to municipal boards, issuing teaching certificates, employing teachers, and supervising the establishment of school districts. The Municipal Boards are involved in decisions concerning the establishment of schools, appointment of teachers, in-service training of teachers, and the supervision of student attendance.

Both the County Governments and Municipal School Boards in Finland are responsible for the preparation of educational plans which are submitted to the National Board of Education. In addition, each level is responsible for the schools which come within its jurisdiction. The Regional Education Services in Vietnam are charged with the responsibility of promoting the development of education in the regions and with the general supervision of elementary and secondary schools. Included in the functions of Provincial Education Services are supervising personnel, managing expenditures, and developing proposals for increased educational services.

Type D: National-Regional-Subregional-Local

The administrative structures of the educational systems of Italy, Cuba, and Thailand are similar in that each has three administrative levels below the national ministry. This type of structure permits a high degree of centralization of educational policy development as well as for the successive decentralization of the implementation of that policy. Whether or not this particular centralization and decentralization does in fact take place is a matter for empirical study and cannot be inferred from the structure. The structures are summarized in Table 4.

In Italy the Ministry of Public Education has wide powers which are subject only to the limits imposed by the authority of the Common Statute and Special Statute Regions. The Ministry promotes public education and establishes schools, supervises state and non-state educational institutions, and promotes adult and higher education. Among their other responsibilities, the Regional School Boards control school construction and organize courses for teacher certification. The Provincial Supervising Bureaus and School Districts share responsibility for the supervision of basic and continuing education.

The responsibility for education at the national level in Thailand is shared by three central agencies: the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of the Interior, and the State University Office. These three agencies individually and jointly formulate plans and policies for education at all levels. Twelve Regional Education Offices provide general supervision of education and organize in-service training for teachers. At the provincial level, seventy-one administrative authorities administer elementary schools, appoint and dismiss teachers, and supervise the schools. Local schools are established and operated by 550 districts (amphurs); the districts share in allocation of funds to schools, enforce attendance and provide general supervision.

The hierarchy of offices and line of communication in the

TABLE 4

FUNCTIONS OF NATIONAL, REGIONAL, SUB-REGIONAL AND LOCAL AGENCIES IN SELECTED COUNTRIES

Country	National Level	Regional Level	Sub-Regional Level	Local Level
Italy	Ministry of Public Education - promotes public education and establishes schools - supervises state and non-state educational institutions - promotes, co-ordinates and supervises adult education - promotes higher education and research	Regional School Boards (15 Common Statute and 5 Special Statute Regions) - organize courses for teacher certification - control school construction - supervise museums and libraries	Provincial Supervising Bureaus - supervise non-state schools - supervise kindergarten and primary schools	School Districts - Supervise basic and continuing education in local schools
Thailand	Ministry of Education; Ministry of Interior; State University Office - formulates plans and policies for education at all levels - develops curricula and prepares textbooks	Regional Education Offices (12) - provide general supervision of education - organize in-service training for teachers	Provincial Administrative Authorities (71) - finance and administer elementary schools - appoint and dismiss teachers - inspect and supervise schools	Districts (550 Amphurs) - establish and operate local schools - enforce attendance - allocate monies and materials for schools - supervise local schools

(continued)

TABLE 4 (continued)

FUNCTIONS OF NATIONAL, REGIONAL, SUB-REGIONAL AND LOCAL AGENCIES IN SELECTED COUNTRIES

Country	National Level	Regional Level	Sub-Regional Level	Local Level
Cuba	Ministry of Education - develops policies, plans the technical guidelines for all aspects of education - supervises the Provincial Directorates	Provincial Directorates - implementation of plans at the Provincial level - supervision of Regional Offices	Regional Directorates - implementation of plans at the Regional level - supervision of Municipal Offices	Municipal Directorates - operation and supervision of schools

administrative structure of education in Cuba is arranged as follows: Minister or First Vice-Minister, Provincial Director, Regional Director, Municipal Director, Supervisor, School Principal, Teacher. In general, all directives follow the established channels and information also follows the appropriate sequence in reaching higher levels from the lower levels. The Ministry of Education develops plans as well as technical guidelines for all aspects of education. The implementation of plans and the supervision of lower level offices is left to each successive level.

Type E: State (or State-Local) - National

The educational administrative structures of this type are those of countries which have a federal governmental structure. The primary authority for education resides with the states which comprise the federation; however, there is also a formal structure at the national or federal level which concerns itself primarily with education and which engages in various activities specified in the constitution. Table 5 presents information on four countries which have been classified as being of this type even though there is considerable variation in the extent of national or federal involvement in education across the four.

Australia and the United States are similar in that the primary authority in each case is the state education department while the national agency has only general functions related mainly to funding. The Commonwealth Department of Education in Australia administers programs of financial assistance, undertakes educational research, and advises on and administers educational policies of the Commonwealth government. The United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, through agencies

TABLE 5

FUNCTIONS AND ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL AGENCIES IN COUNTRIES

WHERE PRIMARY AUTHORITY FOR EDUCATION IS AT STATE LEVEL

Country	Primary Authority	National Agency	Activities and Functions at National Level
Australia	State Education Departments in each of the six States	Commonwealth Department of Education	- advises Commonwealth government on education - administers educational policies - undertakes educational research - administers various programs of financial assistance
United States	State Education Departments in each of the fifty States: local school districts in forty-nine States	Department of Health, Education and Welfare - Office of Education - National Institute of Education	- provides encouragement, financial support and leadership in education - administers programs of financial assistance - formulates program policies - stimulates research and educational development
India	State Education Departments in each of seventeen States	Ministry of Education and Social Welfare	- coordinates educational facilities - determines standards of higher education - promotes scientific and technology research and education - promotes Hindi and the development of all Indian languages - assists State governments with implementation of development plans
Nigeria	Federal Ministry of Education and Ministries of Education in each of twelve States	Federal Ministry of Education	- exercises exclusive responsibility for higher education - develops national policies for education - cooperates with States in evaluation and improvement of education

such as the Office of Education and the National Institute of Education, formulates program policies, administers programs of financial assistance and stimulates research and development. One significant difference in the administrative structures of these two countries is that there are no local school boards in the Australian States while forty-nine of the fifty United States are comprised of school districts with local school boards.

The administration of educational systems in India and Nigeria differs from those of Australia and the United States in that there is a much closer working relationship between the national ministry and the state education departments. The national ministry may have exclusive or at least concurrent authority in areas such as higher education. The Ministry of Education and Social Welfare in India determines standards of higher education, promotes research, coordinates facilities and assists the states with the implementation of development plans for education. The Federal Ministry of Education in Nigeria exercises exclusive responsibility in higher education and cooperates with states in the improvement of education at the other levels.

Although it seems reasonable to expect that there will be similarities in the educational systems of states within a given country, there can also be significant variations. For this reason it is important to bear in mind that together these four countries are comprised of about eighty-five different educational systems.

Type F: State-Local

The countries listed in Table 6 are similar to those presented in

TABLE 6

FUNCTIONS OF PRIMARY AUTHORITY, LOCAL ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS AND COORDINATION MECHANISM IN THREE SELECTED COUNTRIES

Country	Primary Authority	Local Administrative Units	Inter-State Coordination
Canada	Provinces: The Legislatures in each of ten provinces hold responsibility for provision of education at all levels. Departments of Education initiate, implement and administer educational policy.	School Districts - administer elementary and secondary education at the local level - provide and maintain buildings - employ professional and non-professional staff	Council of Ministers of Education - attempts to raise level of interprovincial cooperation - organizes task forces and committees in areas such as curriculum, statistics, instructional media and finance - relates to Federal Government
Federal Republic of Germany	States: The ten Länder and West Berlin have full responsibility for the organization of their educational systems. Education policy is administered through Ministries of Education and Culture.	Local Authorities - limited involvement of local authorities - participation in the appointment of headmasters	Conference of Ministers of Education and Culture - coordinates educational policies Federation-Länder Educational Planning Commission - development of an educational plan and a national educational budget.

(continued)

TABLE 6 (continued)

FUNCTIONS OF PRIMARY AUTHORITY, LOCAL ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS AND COORDINATION MECHANISM IN THREE SELECTED COUNTRIES

Country	Primary Authority	Local Administrative Units	Inter-State Coordination
Switzerland	Cantons: The twenty-five cantons and demi-cantons enjoy a high degree of autonomy in education. Educational systems are administered through the office of Directors of Public Instruction	Communes - exercise rights and responsibilities which have been delegated by the cantons	Conference of Cantonal Directors of Education (Conference DIP) - coordinates educational regulations and requirements - promotes educational reforms

Table 5 in that primary authority also rests with the constituent states or provinces of the country. The main difference is that there does not exist a structure concerned with primary and secondary education at the national level. This does not mean, of course, that there is an absence of federal involvement in education; it means only that the responsibility for that involvement has not been concentrated in a particular unit or agency.

Primary authority and responsibility for education rests with the ten provinces in Canada, the ten Länder and West Berlin in the Federal Republic of Germany, and the twenty-five cantons and demi-cantons in Switzerland. These respective units enjoy a high degree of autonomy in educational matters; thus these three countries include a total of forty-six different educational systems.

In each of these countries, the primary authority shares responsibility for the administration of education with local authorities. The cantons of Switzerland delegate certain responsibilities to the communes and in Germany, local authorities are involved to some extent in the administration of schools. In the provinces of Canada, school districts in each province administer elementary and secondary education at the local level.

All three countries have established some mechanisms for the coordination of policies, programs and developments in various areas of education; it is important to bear in mind that the agencies have been formed by the constituent states and not by the national government. The Council of Ministers of Education in Canada attempts to raise the level of interprovincial cooperation in matters of common concern and in relating to the federal government. The Council carries out its work primarily through organizing task forces and committees which concern themselves with such matters as finance, statistics, instructional media, and materials and curriculum. The Conference of Cantonal Directors of Education performs similar functions in Switzerland while in Germany the Conference of Ministers of Education and Culture coordinates educational policies. Cooperation among states and between the states and the Federal government in the development of educational plans has been furthered by the Federation-Länder Educational Planning Commission which began its work in 1970.

SUMMARY

When the educational policies of different countries are being compared, it is important to bear in mind that education may or may not be a responsibility of the national government. In some countries education is the responsibility of a national ministry or similar agency; however, in others education may fall within the jurisdiction of member states or provinces in a federal political structure. There are also countries in which authority over education is shared by a central government and the constituent states even though prime responsibility may rest with one or the other. The picture is complicated further by the fact that there are various subgroups of these two main groups. This chapter presented some of the characteristics of those different groups and identified some representative countries. Since no sampling was involved in this study, it was not possible to draw any conclusions about the relative distributions of the different types of administrative structures.

Regardless of the number of levels in an administrative structure, national ministries hold general responsibility for planning, supervising, and controlling the operation of national educational systems. The areas subject to national policy usually include curricula, finance, and physical facilities although the degree of control exercised in each area will vary from country to country. Lower levels of the administrative structure hold responsibility for the implementation of policy and may or may not have legislative powers. Areas for local involvement usually include the appointment of teachers, provision of physical facilities, and supervision of the operation of schools. Where education is a state responsibility, the state ministry exercises the same general functions as does the national ministry in the other types of systems.

The presence of state or provincial education systems greatly increases the variability of practices or policies in areas such as the training of administrators and supervisors. Any attempt to describe these practices is confronted by the task of taking into account not only the inter-country variations but also the intra-country variations from state to state. If these variations are sufficiently great, it becomes difficult to generalize about practices in a specific country. This situation appears to hold true in areas such as the policies governing the selection, training, and responsibilities of administrators and supervisors.

Two trends appear evident which have important implications for administrator preparation programs. The first is a move toward greater decentralization in those educational systems which have been highly centralized previously either at the national or state levels. The second is an emphasis on greater coordination in those systems which have tended to operate on a decentralized basis in the past. The implications of these trends are discussed in a later chapter of this report.

CHAPTER III

CATEGORIES AND FUNCTIONS OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL

For general purposes administrative and supervisory personnel can be categorized conveniently according to the level of the educational system at which they hold their appointments. These categories can then be used as a point of departure for discussing the roles and functions of various groups of personnel. The four levels identified in Table 7 are designated as the ministry-central, the ministry-field, the district, and the school level respectively. The chief administrators at the ministry level are senior civil servants who are responsible to the minister, or an equivalent authority, for planning, policy development, program design, and for various service and regulatory functions. Although the specific designations of administrative and ancillary personnel differ greatly from system to system, the functions tend to be quite similar.

The major component of the ministry-field level is the inspectorate which is common to many educational systems. Members of the inspectorate form the link between the central agency and the schools. They may have responsibility for a specific level of the educational system such as primary or secondary, they may be assigned to a particular geographic region, or they may have responsibilities in particular subject areas. The chief administrator at the district level in which this level exists may be either an inspector who has been assigned by the ministry

TABLE 7

CATEGORIZATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL BY SYSTEM LEVEL

Level	Appointment	Administrative Posts/Titles
Ministry-Central	Members of the civil service responsible to minister or equivalent authority.	Permanent Secretary, Superintendent, Deputy Minister; Heads of units with regulatory, planning, and service functions.
Ministry-Field	Members of inspectorate are employed by and responsible to the ministry.	Primary or Secondary Inspector, Normal School Inspector, Regional Inspector, Special Subject Inspector or Supervisor, Consultant
District	Chief officer employed by local authority or assigned to it by ministry; other administrative personnel employed by local authority.	Superintendent, Chief Education Officer, District Education Officer, Director General; Assistant or Deputy Superintendent, Director, Supervisor, Coordinator, Consultant
School	Administrative personnel usually appointed and employed by same agency which employs teachers, either local authority or ministry.	Principals, Headmasters; Assistant Principals or Assistant Headmasters; Head Teachers; Coordinators

to work with the local authority or an employee of the local authority. In larger districts, the administrative structure at the local level may be complex and, in decentralized systems, may even parallel the structure of the central ministry in some respects. In schools which have two or more teachers, one of them is usually designated as the head teacher, principal, director or headmaster. This position appears to be universal across all school systems. In larger schools, the principal or headmaster will also have a small staff of assistants.

ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS AT DIFFERENT LEVELS

The sections which follow are concerned primarily with the last three levels which have been mentioned. Although the central ministry does contain administrators and supervisors, the functions at that level are primarily policy planning and not the direct implementation of policy or administration. The discussions focus on members of the inspectorate, the district education officer, the headmaster and the supervisory personnel at each of these levels.

Ministry-Field Level

The inspectorate is a very important component of the structure of supervisory services in both national and state educational systems. The ministry includes units which are involved with various aspects of financial, facilities, and program planning which relate to other levels of the administrative structure of the educational system; however, it is the inspectorate alone which comes into direct contact with the operation of schools and classrooms on a regular basis. The members of the inspectorate provide the essential link between central planners and administrators on the one hand and teachers, students, and principals on the other.

As is indicated in Table 8, there is a high degree of similarity in the functions or activities of inspectors in different educational systems; the work can be divided conveniently into regulatory or control activities, advisory or consultative activities, and various other duties. The regulatory activities involve making certain that the legal requirements for the conduct of education are being met. In those educational systems where there is minimal local control of education, the inspection involves not only making formal assessments of teachers but of school facilities as well. Formal assessment of teachers is common to the work of inspectors in Austria, New Zealand, and Singapore. Inspection takes on a somewhat different form with respect to the regulatory function in England and Wales where the emphasis is more on reporting to the Secretary of State on the conduct of education than it is on the work of specific teachers. The Federal Inspectorate in Nigeria also concerns itself with broader aspects of the quality of education than just teaching performance.

The advisory or consultative function is also evident in the responsibilities of the inspectorate and is closely related to the regulatory function. As an outcome of the inspection, inspectors are expected to provide professional advice and guidance to teachers and principals of schools. In addition to the general responsibility of working with teachers to improve instruction, inspectors may have specific responsibility for organizing and conducting in-service training sessions

TABLE 8

REGULATORY, ADVISORY, AND OTHER ACTIVITIES OF INSPECTORS

Country	Regulatory Activities	Advisory Activites	Other Activities
Austria	- inspect teaching and evaluate teacher performance - recommend appointment and promotion of teachers and principals	- assist and advise teachers and headmasters	- work on curriculum committees - attend inspectors' conferences
England and Wales	- observe and study education and report to Secretary of State for Science and Education	- transmit advice and new ideas to teachers - conduct in-service courses for teachers	- assist and advise local authorities - prepare advisory publications - give professional advice to Department
Kenya	- inspect schools and examine student teachers - implement new programs	- advise teachers and heads of schools - organize courses and seminars for teachers and headmasters	- recommend suitable textbooks - participate in schools broadcasting programs
New Zealand	- make assessments of teachers and inspect schools formally	- provide professional advice and leadership in curriculum development	- assist ministry with educational improvement
Nigeria	- evaluate quality of teaching, equipment and buildings	- assist teachers to improve instruction - assist with in-service courses for teachers	
Singapore	- officially examine work of teachers for career decisions - examine administration of schools	- offer advice and guidance to teachers and principals - provide motivation and stimulation	

for teachers and for providing leadership in curriculum improvement. The advisory function is of particular importance in those educational systems where there is an inadequate supply of qualified teachers.

Inspectors may also be required to engage in other activities which are of service to the ministry and to education in general. Among these are providing advice and information to the ministry and becoming involved in committee work relating to the development of programs.

A categorization of the functions of inspectors as either regulatory or consultative may not be the most appropriate for describing activities in all educational systems. Particularly in developing countries, the responsibilities of supervisory personnel cannot be restricted to educational functions defined narrowly. For example, Table 9 presents a summary of the educational, administrative, and social functions of elementary supervisors in Paraguay. The educational functions listed for these supervisors include evaluating teaching and learning, and guiding and coordinating the work of teachers, as well as analyzing and solving educational problems. Administrative functions of supervisors include promoting the establishment and construction of schools, promoting greater cooperation between schools and communities, collecting statistical data, and ensuring that school calendars and timetables are completed. The social functions are those which ensure that there will be appropriate relationships between school and community. Inspectors are required to engage in activities which will foster good community relations such as stimulating the development of community associations and participating in social and cultural activities. Cooperative working relationships among inspectors and those involved in

TABLE 9

EDUCATIONAL, ADMINISTRATIVE, AND SOCIAL FUNCTIONS OF ELEMENTARY SUPERVISORS IN PARAGUAY

Educational Functions	Administrative Functions	Social Functions
- participate in preparation, execution and evaluation of educational plans	- promote establishment and construction of schools and improvement of surroundings	- strive for intelligent application of basic principles of human relations
- guide and coordinate the work of teachers	- promote greater cooperation between schools and communities	- stimulate organization of centers that will contribute to the development of the community
- direct teaching-learning processes in order to obtain improved output	- promote the formation of professional libraries	- participate in social, cultural and civic events
- promote improvement of teacher qualifications	- carry out administrative duties related to meetings, communication of directives and issuing of permits	
- analyze problems such as dropouts, repetition of grades and absenteeism	- provide consultation for principals and teachers	
- evaluate outcomes of teaching-learning	- ensure that school calendars and timetables are completed	
- participate in teams engaged in educational studies	- collect and keep statistical data up to date	
	- supervise personnel	

other social services are no doubt highly important for the resolution of various development problems.

One of the consequences of the diversification of school programs is that inspectors are no longer capable of providing adequate supervision in all subject areas; this situation resulted in the creation of positions for special consultants. In Austria, for example, consultants or advisors (Fachinspektoren) have been appointed to supervise such special subjects as art, music, domestic science, and technical and vocational subjects. Their main functions are to ensure that the prescribed curriculum is followed and that the objectives are being achieved. The initial appointments were made on a part-time basis, but more recently these have become full-time positions. An Advisory Teacher Service was inaugurated in Queensland, Australia in 1970. Initially there were eleven Advisory Teachers in the field of mathematics; subsequently the service was increased to include Advisory Teachers in social studies, language arts, secondary mathematics, and secondary social science. Kuwait has introduced supervisors who act as resident inspectors in schools to guide and assist teachers in the teaching of Arabic languages and arithmetic.

District Level

The administrative structure at a district level can be as simple as a single post and only one administrator to a relatively large number of administrative and supervisory posts. The chief administrator may be designated as the local inspector, the district education officer, the superintendent of schools, or the director of education and other possible variations. He may be employed either by the ministry of education and assigned to work in a particular geographic region or he may be employed by a district board. In either case his responsibilities will be similar. The chief administrator exercises general supervision over all educational activities and personnel in the district including teachers and principals as well as the central administrative and supervisory staff, if there is one.

In general the role and functions of district superintendents are not too different from those of members of the inspectorate, particularly in small jurisdictions. The major difference is probably that some inspectors may be able to focus specifically on teaching-learning and not become as deeply involved in the administrative matters associated with finance and physical facilities as are district education officers.

Just as the general functions of inspectors do not vary greatly across educational systems, so is there also a high degree of similarity in the functions of chief administrative officers at the district level. This is illustrated by the comparison of roles and functions of district education officers in India and district superintendents in one province of Canada which is presented in Table 10. The categories of roles and statements for India based on those which appear in the report of the National Seminar on the Role, Function, Recruitment and Training of District Education Officers which was held in 1970; the corresponding statements for the Province of Saskatchewan are taken from the Manual of Administration of the Department of Education. Even though there are some differences, the similarities in the two sets of statements are noteworthy. In each case there are functions associated with personnel

TABLE 10

COMPARISON OF ROLE OF DISTRICT EDUCATION OFFICER IN INDIA AND DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT IN SASKATCHEWAN, CANADA

India	Saskatchewan, Canada
Role as an administrator	
- Personnel administration: appointment, promotion and transfer of teaching and non-teaching staff; their performance appraisal and disciplinary control	- Organize, direct and supervise the work of subordinate staff
- Inspection of subordinate offices	- Select, induct, train and motivate subordinate staff; assess performance and recommend promotions
- Financial administration; grant-in-aid; teachers' salaries; audit and inspection of accounts	- Provide assistance to local authorities on all matters related to finance, school organization, administration, and facilities
- Dealing with disputes between teachers and management	- Act as a mediator in resolving problems
- Dealing with local bodies	- Provide assistance to local authorities in the selection and placement of teachers
Role as a Supervisor and Inspector	
- Providing academic leadership and technical advice for improving the teaching-learning process in schools	- Improve quality of instruction by classroom visits, evaluation of performance, and promoting improved teaching techniques

(continued)

TABLE 10 (continued)

COMPARISON OF ROLE OF DISTRICT EDUCATION OFFICER IN INDIA AND
DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT IN SASKATCHEWAN, CANADA

India	Saskatchewan, Canada
Role as professional leader	
- Organizing orientation and in-service programs; encouraging experiments and innovations	- Provide leadership at, and promote seminars, workshops and institutes
Role as a developmental generalist	
- Collaborating with other departments in developmental planning of the district; implementing and evaluating educational plans	- Providing assistance to local school authorities and other organizations in arranging special courses for persons outside school systems
Role as a bridge-builder between school and community	
- Fostering public relations; securing community participation for improving education	- Maintain effective public relations through attending meetings, giving lectures, and interviewing persons interested in education

administration, supervision and professional leadership, administration of finance and facilities, and community activities. The only area of role in which there is a lack of correspondence is in that of the developmental generalist; there is no specific function which is closely related to this in Saskatchewan.

In educational systems where substantial authority has been delegated to local school systems, the functions of the district education officer take on increased scope. This is indicated by the following statement which describes the situation in the United States:

> The functions of the board of education in determining educational policies, and of the superintendent of schools in executing these policies, include a broad range of duties and responsibilities. Together, the board and the superintendent are responsible for preparing the school budget and, in most cases, for determining the amount of local taxes necessary to finance the school program. They are responsible for hiring teachers and other school personnel, for providing and maintaining school buildings, for purchasing school equipment and supplies, and, in most cases, for providing transportation facilities for pupils who live beyond a reasonable walking distance from school. Their duties also include enacting rules and regulations consistent with State law and regulations of the State department of education governing operation of the schools.[1]

The discharge of these responsibilities may require the development of a complex administrative structure at the district level. The district superintendent may be assisted by general assistant superintendents or by assistants who carry out functions in specified areas such as elementary or secondary programs, financial services, student services and so forth. The district may also have a staff of consultants, coordinators or directors in special fields such as reading, physical education and industrial arts. In some large jurisdictions, there may even be subordinate administrative personnel who are responsible for different geographic areas of the school district.

---

[1] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Progress of Education in the United States of America: 1970-71 and 1971-72, Report for the Thirty-Fourth International Conference on Education (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973), p. 31.

The consultants who are assigned on a full-time or part-time basis to work with teachers in a specific subject area will engage in many of the activities which are carried out by the superintendent or inspector in small jurisdictions. These will include visiting classrooms to observe instruction, helping teachers, organizing in-service training programs and stimulating activities which will lead to improvements in curriculum and in instruction. In some systems, there is a definite requirement that consultants should not become involved in formal evaluations of teachers. The Province of British Columbia, Canada, has regulations which prohibit supervisors from evaluating the work of teachers in a written report and teacher consultants from making evaluations of teachers in discussions with the principal or superintendent.

School Level

Although size is an obvious factor which determines the administrative structure at the school level, these structures tend to remain relatively simple and consist only of the headmaster or principal with some assistants in larger schools. Principals are usually given responsibility for the management of the school and its facilities, for the supervision of personnel, and for the organization of the educational program. The specific activities in these general areas will be determined by the extent to which authority for significant decisions rests at the school level. In some systems the principal may be involved mainly in the supervision of physical facilities and with general school organization; in others, he may be deeply involved in the determination of program, the selection and evaluation of staff, or educational improvement activities.

In most Australian schools, principals have authority to experiment with the program and organization of the schools in whatever way appears desirable. Decisions on what is taught and what materials to use tend to be made at the school level in England and Scotland. Secondary school principals in New Zealand are given the following responsibilities:

- controlling the buildings and premises
- recommending appointment or dismissal of assistant teachers
- maintaining discipline of the school
- regulating all methods, textbooks, organization and determining the course of study for each pupil

There appears to be a general trend toward giving the principal increased responsibility for stimulating the professional growth of teachers and for carrying out the consultation function in cooperation with inspectors or other district personnel.

NUMBER OF ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL

It is difficult to determine the proportion of educational personnel who are in administrative and supervisory positions from available statistical data. This is due to the variations in the ways in which educational personnel are classified and the fact that many administrators and supervisors in education do not carry those responsibilities on a full-time basis; thus, some reports may class certain positions as instructional, others as non-instructional and still others as both. In spite of these problems, it is possible to obtain some general indications of current practices and policies.

There is evidence that the ratio of teachers to inspectors or supervisors in most educational systems is relatively high. In Saudi Arabia and in the Republic of Vietnam, regional inspectors or counsellors are expected to visit each school twice during a year; if a full day is allowed for such a visit the inspector could supervise about one hundred schools.

The number of teachers supervised by an inspector in Austria ranges from 200 to 600, the latter being the maximum number. In Saudi Arabia, educational supervisors at the primary level are expected to inspect about 200 teachers. The data summarized below from various reports gives further indication of the high teacher to inspector ratio:

Country	Total No. of Inspectors	Total No. of Teachers
Algeria	508	69,600
Tunisia		
Primary	305	19,582
Secondary	70	6,970
Kenya		
Primary	314	53,536

The proportion in Algeria is one inspector for almost 140 teachers at all levels. At the primary level in Tunisia it is one inspector for every 64 teachers but at the secondary level it is close to one inspector per one hundred teachers. The members of the Kenya inspectorate work under a proportion of one inspector for about every 170 teachers. The latter proportion appears even less favorable when it is considered that the 314 members of the inspectorate includes 47 inspectors and 267 assistant inspectors.

All of these data tend to support the contention that the inspectorate comprises only a very small percentage of the total complement of educational personnel. For those systems which are attempting to cope with a large number of underqualified teachers, the percentage is probably far too small.

The available data for principals and other administrators at the school level tend to support what could be expected from general knowledge about the size of schools at various levels. For example, the data for 1972 in Japan for schools at various levels are as follows:

	Elementary	Lower Secondary	Upper Secondary
Principals	21,935	9,108	2,970
Teachers	383,608	237,016	238,834

Thus, the ratio of principals to teachers is about one to seventeen at the elementary level, one to twenty-five at the lower secondary level, and one to eighty at the upper secondary level.

In 1973 Singapore reported data as follows:

	Primary & Secondary	Vocational & Technical
Principals and Vice-Principals	526	20
Teachers	19,312	736

The primary and secondary schools had one principal for every thirty-seven teachers while the ratio in vocational and technical schools was one for every thirty-five teachers.

The distribution of instructional personnel in the United States in 1969-70 was as follows:

Position	Number
Principals and Asst. Principals	90,593
Consultants, Supervisors	31,537
Classroom Teachers	2,023,253
Librarians	39,790
Guidance	46,189
Psychological	5,622
Other Non-Supervisory	16,508
Total	2,253,492

This indicates that about one out of every twenty-five in the instructional group was either a principal or an assistant principal and about one out of every seventy-two members was a consultant or supervisor.

The number of administrative personnel required at any particular level is affected by numerous factors some of which have already been mentioned. Existing practices are not necessarily those which are the most desirable; they may only reflect what is feasible under present circumstances. As has been mentioned, the number of inspectors or special supervisors required will depend upon factors such as the level of training of teachers, the extent of centralization of decisions about curriculum, and the size of the area to be supervised. Similarly, the number of administrators required at a district or a school level will depend upon the particular responsibilities to be discharged at that level. Some educational systems have found it necessary or desirable to attempt to set policy on the number of administrative personnel at various levels; this was probably motivated both by the desire to ensure adequate service as well as the need to control costs. Some examples are presented here as illustrations of the development of policy in this area by the Province of Quebec, Canada.

The number of administrative positions permitted in a school is determined by the number of pupils. In a secondary school these are as follows:

Number of Pupils	Principals	Vice-Principals	Administrative Assistants
225-499	1	-	-
500-899	1	1	-
900-1199	1	2	-
1200-1499	1	2	1
1500-1999	1	3	1
2000-2299	1	4	1
2300-2599	1	4	1
2600-3099	1	5	1
3100-3599	1	6	1
3600 or over	1	7	1

As is evident, the adjustment to the increased administrative load of larger schools is made up by increasing the number of vice-principals and the addition of an administrative assistant.

Other school systems have also set standards. The Province of Nova Scotia specifies that a school must have ten or more rooms before there can be a full-time principal; for smaller schools, one of the teachers is designated as the principal. A school must have twenty-five or more rooms before a full-time vice-principal can be appointed; below that level, vice-principals are only part-time appointments, and the remainder of the load is made up through a teaching assignment.

The Province of Quebec has also set the conditions for appointment of administrators to the school district level. The executive or cadre positions have been classified as level 0, 1 or 2. The title of positions which fall into each of these levels are listed below:

Level	Position Title
0	Director General Deputy Director General
1	Director of Elementary Teaching Services Director of Secondary Teaching Services Director of Teaching Services Director of Student Services Director of Financial Services Director of Building and Equipment Services Director of Personnel Services
2	Coordinator of Secondary Teaching Coordinator of Technical & Vocational Training Coordinator of Exceptional Children Teaching Coordinator of Standards and Evaluation Assistant to the Director of ....

The maximum number of positions for school systems which offer both elementary and secondary education for different numbers of students are as follows:

	Maximum Number of Positions			
Number of Students	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Total
2,000 - 2,999	1	2	0	3
3,000 - 3,999	1	3	0	4
4,000 - 4,999	1	4	1	5
5,000 - 5,999	1	5	1	6
6,000 - 6,999	1	6	2	7
7,000 - 7,999	1	6	3	8
8,000 - 9,499	1	7	4	9
9,500 -10,999	2	7	5	10
11,000 -12,999	2	7	6	11
13,000 -14,999	2	7	7	12
15,000 -17,499	2	7	8	13

The grid allows school boards some discretion as to how appointments to the total maximum will be distributed across the three levels. For example, a school system which has 10,000 students may decide to retain a higher number of positions at levels 1 or 2 rather than to make a second level 0 appointment.

The extent to which other educational systems have attempted to regularize the number of administrative and supervisory positions remains undetermined. Infrequent mention of such standards was made in the documents reviewed for this report.

SUMMARY

Administrative and supervisory personnel can be placed into four broad groups which are located at four distinct levels in an educational system: personnel in central ministries, field personnel representing the ministry at an intermediate level, members of the administrative structure at a district level, and administrators at the school level. Primary attention was given in this chapter of the report to the last three.

The functions of the ministry-field personnel can be categorized as being either regulatory or advisory. Regulatory activities involve the inspection and evaluation of facilities, programs, and personnel. Advisory or consultative activities are those which are intended to provide assistance to teachers and administrators in areas such as program development and instructional improvement. Some ministry-field personnel are expected also to carry out other functions in relation to social and community development. Supervisors appear to face universal problems of insufficient time to perform their assigned functions and of integrating the functions effectively with each other.

When administrative officers are appointed at a district level their functions may not be too different from inspectors, particularly in small systems. However, in the larger, decentralized systems, the education officer at the district level may carry substantial responsibilities. These responsibilities may result in the creation of a large and complex administrative structure.

The post of headmaster or principal at the school level appears to be universal; however, the definition of the functions associated with the role are variable. In some systems principals have substantial authority in areas of curriculum and the supervision of personnel while in others their functions are described in routine terms with limited authority in these areas.

The information available tended to indicate that many supervisors and administrators work under an undesirable supervision load in terms of the number of teachers or the geographic area served. Some educational systems have developed standards for the number of administrators required at particular levels. This would appear to be a desirable development if the demands on the time and energies of administrative and supervisory personnel, as well as the cost of those services, are to be kept within reasonable limits.

CHAPTER IV

APPOINTMENT AND CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

There are important variations in the extent to which the policies and practices governing the appointment of administrators are specified at national, state, and local levels. In some educational systems the minimum requirements are clearly enunciated while in others they are left vague. Even where the requirements are specified, there usually are provisions for departures from the specifications; in addition, the relative weights which are placed on different selection criteria probably vary from situation to situation. In the section which follows some of the requirements in different education systems are reviewed. This discussion is followed first by an examination of certification practices and then by a review of selection and appointment policies.

REQUIREMENTS FOR APPOINTMENT

Where minimum requirements for appointment are specified, the criteria normally include formal education, teaching qualifications, and experience; in some instances, additional factors or criteria are mentioned. The minimum requirements for appointment to the posts of principal and vice-principal are summarized in Table 11 for selected school systems.

In the Syrian Arab Republic and in Singapore, a university degree appears to be required for appointment to the post of principal of secondary schools but not for primary schools. In Quebec, Canada, a similar difference in total number of years of formal education is observed between

TABLE 11

REQUIREMENTS FOR APPOINTMENT AS PRINCIPAL OR VICE-PRINCIPAL IN SELECTED EDUCATION SYSTEMS

Country and Post	University Education	Teaching Qualification	Minimum Experience	Other
Syrian Arab Republic				
Principal, Primary		Yes	Teaching 5 years	Professional average grade of not less than 75% in last two years
Principal, Secondary	University degree or teaching certificate		Teaching 5 years or 2 years as Asst. Princ.	
Cyprus				
Headmaster		Yes	3 years as Asst. Headmaster	Seniority and merit
Asst. Head		Yes	Teaching 10 years	Seniority and merit
Singapore				
Principal, Primary		Yes	Teaching 10 years	No existing regulations
Principal, Secondary	Degree	Yes	Teaching 10 years	No existing regulations
Japan				
Principal		First Class Certificate	Teaching 5 years	Examination for the principal's qualification
Quebec				
Principal, Primary	At least 15 years	Permanent Certificate	3 years related experience if there is at least 1 vice-princ.; 5 years teaching if no vice-principal	Experience in skills of problem solving in technical and administrative matters
Principal, Secondary	At least 16 yrs. of ed.	Permanent Certificate	3 years experience as vice-principal	As Above
Vice-Principal	At least 15 yrs. of ed.	Permanent Certificate	Teaching 5 years	

primary and secondary principals with the latter requiring one more year of university education. Cyprus and Japan do not specify that a university degree is required.

In the education systems listed in Table 11, principals are expected to hold teaching qualifications and presumably the highest level of certificate which is available. The appointment of persons as principals with backgrounds other than in teaching appears to be extremely rare, if not even non-existent.

Where criteria are elaborated they also tend to include some specification of minimum experience either in teaching or in administration. The amount of time varies from a minimum of about three years to a maximum of thirteen years in teaching. In Cyprus the minimum time for appointment as principal appears to be about thirteen years in total since a person must have ten years of teaching experience in order to be appointed as assistant principal and prospective principals must have three years of experience as an assistant. The Province of Quebec differentiates the requirement for principals who are appointed to schools where there is at least one vice-principal and those in which there is none. In the latter case the principal is required to have five years of teaching experience while in the former he requires only three years of related experience.

The category of other factors reflects a further range in practices. The Syrian Arab Republic attaches an academic requirement in that principals are expected to have a professional average grade of not less than seventy-five percent in the last two years. In Cyprus seniority and merit are mentioned while in Singapore principals are required to know the existing regulations. The requirements for principals in Quebec include experience in the skills of problem-solving in technical and administrative matters; the documents reviewed for this report did not specify how some of these other characteristics were evaluated.

Various other characteristics or criteria seem to be emphasized but the details were not available. Saudi Arabia specifies that it is not seniority but the possession of desirable qualities of character and behavior which qualify people to be appointed as headmasters and administrators. In Lebanon, headmasters are expected to possess certain requisite public, moral, professional and technical qualifications. The appointment of principals in Cuba is based on a comprehensive evaluation of every factor and element which is considered to be essential to the profile of a leader.

The requirements for appointment to the post of district superintendent or district education officer tend to be similar to those which have been outlined for principals. These requirements for some selected education systems are presented in Table 12. In general, the level of university education for these systems tends to be higher for district education officers than for principals; whereas the latter are required to have the equivalent of one degree, the requirement for the former tends to be two degrees. In Quebec, Canada, a second degree is preferred while in Saskatchewan, Canada, and Gujarat State, India, it is required. The Syrian Arab Republic requires only one university degree together with a diploma in education. These posts also require teaching experience and perhaps administrative experience at lower levels. Quebec requires from three to five years of experience in such posts while Gujarat State requires at least seven years of teaching and administrative experience.

TABLE 12

REQUIREMENTS FOR APPOINTMENT AS EDUCATION OFFICER IN SELECTED-EDUCATION SYSTEMS

System and Post	University Education	Teaching Qualification	Minimum Experience	Other
Quebec Director General or Asst. D.G.	A first degree requiring at least 17 yrs. total education and preferably a second degree or equivalent	Not specified	3 yrs. as a director or service of 5 yrs. as a coordinator or 5 yrs. as a school principal	Experience in skills of problem-solving in complex technical and administrative matters
Saskatchewan District Supt. of Education	Two university degrees or equivalent, one in education	Professional Certificate	Successful teaching experience in Canada at elementary, secondary or post-secondary level	Demonstrated proven competence in educational administration
Gujarat District Education Officer	First class Bachelor's degree or Second Class Master's degree and B.Ed.; Second Class Bachelor's degree with M.Ed. or Ph.D. in Education		Seven years teaching, inspecting and administrative experience	Age not more than 40 years; four weeks training at the Administrative Training School
Syrian Arab Republic Provincial Directors	University degree	Diploma in education	Experience in teaching	

As it does for its principals, Quebec specifies that directors general must have experience in the skills of problem-solving in complex technical and administrative matters; Saskatchewan expects demonstrated competence in educational administration. Gujarat State adds the requirement that the education officer must not be more than forty years of age and is required to take four weeks of training.

CERTIFICATION OF ADMINISTRATORS

Some national or state education systems have formalized their requirements by instituting certification for administrators. The administrator's certificate is a license to practice administration in the same way that a teacher's license enables the holder to teach in certain schools or at certain levels. Certification may serve to upgrade the qualifications of administrators or it may also be used to regularize and control the appointment practices of local education authorities. The normal requirements for administrator certificates include teaching qualifications, experience, and a specified academic background. A limited number of examples will serve to illustrate the range of practices.

The Republic of Liberia adopted new requirements and procedures for the certification of educational personnel in 1972. Certificates were instituted for the administrative personnel listed in Table 13. As is indicated by this summary, the amount of formal education required ranges from two years for the Elementary School Principal certificate to a Bachelor's Degree for upper level positions. In each case there is a minimum experience requirement of five years. A number of the certificates

TABLE 13

REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMINISTRATOR'S CERTIFICATES IN LIBERIA

Certificate	Teacher Certificate	Experience	Other
Kindergarten and Elementary School Principal	Grade B or equivalent (Requires two years of college or university work)	Not less than 5 years of teaching experience in kindergarten or an elementary school	A semester's work or three semester hours of elementary school administration OR two years of successful administrative experience
Junior/Senior High School Principal	Grade A or equivalent (Requires completion of a four-year college or university course)	Not less than 5 years of teaching experience in a junior or senior high school	A semester's work or three semester hours of elementary or secondary school administration OR two years successful administrative experience on a lower level
Supervising Principal	Minimum of a Bachelor's Degree	Not less than 5 years of administrative experience at the elementary or secondary level	At least twelve semester hours in school administration
Instructional Supervisors	Minimum of a Bachelor's Degree	A minimum of five years of teaching experience	At least twenty-four semester hours in a specialized subject area
Supervisors of Schools	Minimum of a Bachelor's Degree	A minimum of five years of administrative experience	A semester's work or three semester hours in elementary or secondary school administration OR two years of administrative experience

require some formal study in the area of school administration; however, in some instances successful administrative experience (presumably acquired before the certification requirement was implemented) may be presented in lieu of the formal study.

The Province of New Brunswick is one of the few in Canada which has formalized requirements for administrator's certificates; these are summarized in Table 14. In order to be eligible for a certificate , department heads, subject coordinators, and vice-principals must hold an undergraduate degree and have three years of teaching experience. The Principal's Certificate requires the equivalent of five years of university education and five years of teaching experience. A further specification relates to the areas or courses in which formal study must have been completed. The principal's certificate requires six courses in the areas of educational administration while other level certificates require three courses in specified areas.

Only one state in the United States of America does not have certification requirements for principals and superintendents. A recent report prepared by the University Council for Educational Administration stated that the course and experience requirements varied considerably from state to state. The following general summary was provided:

> The modal teaching experience requirement for principals among states is three years; the maximum required by a state is five years. For the school superintendency, the maximum amount of teaching experience required for certification is eight years. The modal teaching experience requirements for superintendents is three years, as it is for principals. Thirteen states require both teaching and administrative experience for school

TABLE 14

REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMINISTRATOR'S CERTIFICATES IN NEW BRUNSWICK, CANADA

	Academic and Professional	Experience	Specified Studies
Department Head and Subject Coordinator	Teacher's License; Undergraduate degree (4 years)	Three years of teaching experience	Three university courses in subject area supervised
Elementary School Principal	Teacher's License; Post-graduate degree, certificate or diploma (5 yrs.)	Five years of teaching; two must be at elementary level	Six university courses: organization and administration of the elementary school; two of administrative theory, supervision of instruction, legal aspects of education; three of economics of education, personnel administration, research or others
Secondary School Principal	Teacher's License; Post-graduate degree, certificate or diploma (5 yrs.)	Five years of teaching; two must be at secondary level	As above but first course must be on organization and administration of secondary school
Vice-Principal	Teacher's License; Undergraduate degree (4 years)	Three years of teaching experience; two of these at level to be administered	A minimum of three courses from among those acceptable for the Principal's Certificate

superintendency certification.[1]

These requirements for certification are similar to those of the school systems which have already been discussed and similar to the requirements for appointment where there is no formal certification.

The academic requirement for certification tends to be at the Master's degree level or higher as is indicated in Table 15. At the elementary principal's level, only three states require less than a Master's degree; at the secondary and superintendency levels, the numbers are two and one respectively. The academic requirements for the district superintendent tend to be noticeably higher than they are for the principal's level; a number of states require studies which approach those required for the doctorate.

In most states there is some specification of the content of studies in terms of courses in specific subjects. The UCEA report summarizes the situation as follows:

> ...certain courses tend to be required much more frequently in the various states than others. The following listed from those most frequently required to those less frequently required, were: school organization and administration, curriculum development, supervision, school finance, educational measurement, school law, school-community relations, foundations of education, evaluation research, and school plant design and operations. Other courses, which are required by fewer states, are staff development, field experience (including internship) group dynamics, student personnel and business management. Some states also require social science courses.[2]

---

[1] University Council for Educational Administration, The Preparation and Certification of Educational Administrators: A UCEA Commission Report, (Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1973), p. 17.

[2] Ibid.

TABLE 15

DISTRIBUTION OF NUMBERS OF STATES BY MINIMUM ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE CERTIFICATES (UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)

Academic Requirement	Elementary School Principals	Secondary School Principals	District Superintendents
None specified at State level	1	1	2
Less than Master's Degree	3	2	1
Master's Degree	33	32	15
Master's Degree and up to 15 additional semester hours	8	10	2
Master's Degree and more than 16 additional semester hours	5	5	26
Six years	1	1	1
Seven years	-	-	1
Ed. Sp.	-	-	3

Note: Table 15 includes data for the Federal District of Columbia

Source: Preliminary information for 1973 Certification Manual (NEA) supplied by Educational Research Service, Inc.

The UCEA survey reports that there is an increasing tendency for greater flexibility in certification requirements. About one-half of the states reported that the certification was handled through approval by the state agency responsible for certification of programs offered in universities. Although there is a trend toward increasing flexibility in requirements, there is also a trend in the direction of increasing the number of years of experience and the number of courses. There was no indication of any definite moves away from the certification of administrators in spite of the criticisms which have been made by those concerned about undesirable consequences.

The possession of an administrator's certificate does not, of course, ensure the individual that he will be appointed to an administrative post; it merely makes him eligible for such appointment. The employing authority will still weigh various factors and impose other criteria in making the decision of whether or not to appoint a particular individual.

RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION PRACTICES

The different structures of educational systems and the divisions of authority across levels are reflected in the policies which govern the recruitment and selection of administrators. The appointment of members of the inspectorate and senior level administrators is generally made by the ministry or the public service commission. In some instances the district education officer is appointed by the ministry while in others he is appointed by the local authority. Some of these variations in practice are indicated by the examples summarized for specific countries.

Australia

Since most administrative functions are centralized at the state level, the state department holds the authority to appoint principals. Vacant positions are advertised in the offical publication of the education department in each state and applications are invited from eligible members of the teaching staff. The applications are then considered on the basis of seniority, qualifications and status, and the appointment is made by the department.

Scotland

The posts for headmasters and directors of education are normally advertised both locally and nationally. The selection is normally made by the education committee of the local authority. Other administrative posts are either advertised or filled by promotion from within.

Singapore

Different appointment procedures are followed for government schools than for government-aided schools. Appointments to positions in government schools are made by the public service commission. For principalships in government-aided schools, applications received as a result of advertisement are reviewed by the management committee which makes a recommendation for appointment to the director of education.

Ghana

In Ghana, the Ministry has set certain academic and experience requirements for appointment to the headships of schools. These criteria are used by the managing authorities for the selection and appointment of principals in primary schools. At the secondary level the post is advertised and the selection made by the public service commission in collaboration with the ministry of education.

Saudi Arabia

Men and women who have distinguished themselves through their teaching performance and who have demonstrated other desirable qualities are considered for administrative and supervisory appointments. The appointment is made for a trial period and the success during this period is used to determine whether or not an individual has administrative potential.

Canada and the United States

The appointment of principals and district administrative personnel is a responsibility of the district board. Normally, positions are advertised at least at the provincial or state level; however, vacancies may also be filled through appointments from within. Senior administrative posts may be advertised in a number of states or even nationally.

Although these are the reported general policies or approaches to the recruitment and selection of administrators, no doubt actual studies would reveal many important additional practices. For example, the means by which potential administrators make themselves visible in countries where there is no advertising of vacancies would provide valuable insights into the recruitment practices. The relative emphasis placed on various criteria, either explicit or implicit would also reveal some interesting facets of the operation of educational systems.

SUMMARY

The requirements for appointment to administrative posts vary in formalization from system to system. In some systems the desired qualifications are clearly specified whereas in others they may be outlined only in terms of general statements, if they are mentioned at all. The more specific requirements usually include reference to minimum university education, teaching qualifications, and teaching experience. Some systems have formalized their requirements to the stage of having certification for administrators and supervisors which usually includes a requirement for formal study in the area of administration.

Specific recruitment and selection practices also vary from system to system as well as from post to post within a system. Administrators and supervisors employed by a ministry may be required to go through the same selection procedures as are other employees in the public service. In some smaller centralized systems, these public service employment procedures extend to the level of the principalship; however, local appointments whether they are at the district or the school level more frequently are the result of advertisement, formal application, and selection on the basis of criteria specified by the local authorities.

There appears to be a very limited amount of systematic information available about the recruitment, selection, and appointment practices for administrators and supervisors. This would appear to be an area which requires further study; however, the methods of the study must be other than the review of documentary materials. Field observations, interviews, questionnaires and related methods would have to be used to obtain the desired data.

CHAPTER V

PRE-SERVICE AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMS

The practices in different educational systems reflect the variety of approaches that can be taken to providing pre-service and in-service training programs for administrative and supervisory personnel. In some cases the training of administrators is seen as a responsibility of the ministry of education, and preparation programs are made available under the auspices of the ministry. The ministry may also cooperate with other agencies such as professional associations in these training activities. Since preparation is a continuing responsibility, the ministry may even create a special center or agency which is given the specific responsibility of providing pre- or in-service training. The initiative to create a unit which gives special attention to administrator training might also be taken by a university or a school of education. Particularly in developing countries, training programs have become a matter in which a number of countries and international agencies have cooperated. Some of the specific programs which have been developed are summarized in this chapter.

Although it is useful to try to distinguish between pre-service and in-service programs, few activities are clearly either one or the other. The same program might serve both as an in-service activity for some administrators while for others it is the first step toward an administrative career. Training programs or development opportunities which are clearly restricted to one group or the other seem to be the exception rather than the rule in existing practices.

MINISTRY SPONSORED OR SUPPORTED PROGRAMS

In some countries, states, or provinces, the ministry of education accepts the responsibility for organizing and conducting both pre-service and in-service training programs. The pre-service programs are likely to be directly related to certification requirements while in-service programs probably arise out of the policy to promote the improvement of administrative practice. A number of examples of these different types of programs are outlined in this section.

Pre-Certification Programs

The Ministry of Education of the Province of Ontario, Canada, organizes a four-week course for principals at selected centers each summer. Successful completion of the course leads to the Elementary or Secondary School Principal's Certificate. The admission requirements include a teacher's certificate, a B.A. or B.Sc. or higher degree, and five years of teaching experience. In addition, the applicant must have been considered as above average in competence during at least the last two years of this experience.

Although there is a formal program of studies, provision is also made for individuals to define their own professional needs and interests. Participants are expected to remain in residence during the course, and considerable importance is attached to the informal discussions which are part of the interaction among course members. The formal topics in a course might include such themes as leadership, problems of the principalship, the role of the principal, trends and innovations in education, educational philosophies, and program development. The methods include lectures, group discussions and seminars, and activities associated with use of films and videotaped materials.

Candidates for the advanced Secondary Principal's Certificate attend a special course which is normally designed on site to meet the specific learning needs of the members. Generally, the applicants for this course have already held the post of principal or vice-principal in a secondary school and will have completed the first course.

As a result of participating in a course, prospective or practicing principals are expected to have a better understanding of the role of the principal and of his relations to various units in the administrative structure and to teachers. The activities in the course should also have given him the opportunity to develop some of his skills in group relations and leadership.

In-Service Courses

In the Libyan Arab Republic, as in many other countries, intensive efforts are underway to raise the level of qualifications of teaching, supervisory, and administrative personnel in education. One of the strategies for achieving this has been to organize courses directed toward specific groups in education and concerned with specific topics; some of these have focused on administrators and administrative problems. In 1971-72, the Ministry of Education organized eight local courses and participated in three additional courses which were held outside of the country. The four courses concerned with school administration are summarized below:

Course	Participants	Number
1. Techniques of school administration	Headmasters of primary schools	30
2. School administration; methods and problems	Headmasters and some administrative inspectors	688
3. Modern inspection; qualities of successful inspectors	Newly-appointed inspectors in primary education	93
4. Symposium on the problems of primary education	Administrative personnel in primary education	100

For the year 1972-73 the following additional two courses were proposed:

Course	Participants	Number
1. Training course	Headmasters and headmistresses of primary schools	500
2. Training course	Inspectors of primary schools	242

Information on the specific content and methodology of these courses was not available.

Presumably, the courses listed above and those offered by other ministries are of relatively short duration. An example of a longer term course is the one organized for school principals in Thailand. The duration of this course is about three months and is normally held during the vacation period from February 15 to May 15. It is organized by the Division of Government Schools in the Department of Secondary Education in collaboration with the Teachers' Council. All of the participants consultants and advisors must stay in residence provided by the Teachers'

Council since activities are scheduled during evenings as well as in regular daytime sessions.

The features of the 1971 course are probably representative of those which have characterized other courses. A total of ninety-five participants attended the course; forty-five were selected from among teachers in various schools throughout the country, and fifty were newly-appointed principals who had not attended the course before. The criteria applied to the selection of the teacher participants included the following: age from 27 to 45 years, holder of a Bachelor's degree, designated as an assistant principal or a subject department head in a secondary school, and having at least five years of teaching experience. In addition to the characteristics mentioned, a number of personal factors are also taken into account. An applicant must also be recommended by his principal or some other administrator.

The advisors selected for the course were secondary school principals who met the following criteria: at least fifteen years experience as principal, holder of a master's degree, age forty to fifty-nine, and recommended by his superiors. Eleven persons from the central Ministry were invited to attend as consultants; a number of guest speakers made presentations on specific topics.

The normal daily activities consisted of a lecture in the morning followed by group discussions in the afternoon. Lectures were given on various topics including the role of the principal, educational technology, testing and evaluation, student government, school records, teacher evaluation, the principal and Thai culture, adult education and curriculum. A series of school visits were organized near the end of the course.

In-service courses of this type for principals, perhaps of shorter duration, are available in other educational systems as well. For example, in Alberta, Canada, a two-week resident course for school principals has been held in July of each year since 1956. A number of agencies cooperate in organizing the course, and participants are sponsored by their school districts. The fees paid by the districts cover the basic costs of offering the course. Each year the course focuses on a different theme, and principals may attend more than once. The courses normally include lectures and group activities of various forms. Participants have consistently evaluated the courses as useful in-service activities.

A similar two-week resident course has been sponsored by the Canadian Education Association for school superintendents and personnel from ministries of education in the various provinces. The course follows a similar format of lectures and group activities, although the topics and themes vary from year to year in response to changing conditions and issues. The twenty-first annual course was held in 1973; the number of participants averages about seventy for each course.

Summer Programs

The Department of Education of the Province of Nova Scotia, Canada, offers a Summer School Program which provides opportunities for teachers to meet requirements for permanent certificates, to obtain higher certificates, or to prepare themselves for specific responsibilities. One special program is offered in educational administration.

This program consists of a total of twelve thirty-hour courses; at least eight of these are in the specialization while four can be related courses. Candidates are expected to complete the program requirements in four consecutive summer sessions.

Courses in educational administration are developed around themes such as the fundamentals of educational administration, the elementary school principal, secondary school administration, principles of supervision, school personnel administration, principles of school law, and public school finance. Other courses which are available focus on topics such as curriculum, educational reasearch, and educational media.

Applicants for admission are required to have a Nova Scotia Teacher's Certificate Class 3, two years of teaching experience and a written recommendation as to suitability from a supervisor or an inspector of schools.

SPECIAL TRAINING CENTERS

Some education systems have responded to the need for providing opportunities for the pre-service and in-service training of administrative personnel by creating agencies which have this as their prime if not sole function. In Cuba, for example, the recruitment and in-service training of leadership personnel is a function of the Ministry's National Office for Personnel and Cadres. Short courses are conducted regularly for educational directors and school principals in the School for Cadres. Similarly, in the Republic of Vietnam, the in-service training of teachers is the responsibility of a permanent center created for this purpose with a budget specifically designated for in-service training. The courses which are offered deal with curriculum and instruction as well as with school administration. In 1972 a total of fifty-eight courses attracted or enrolled approximately 4,000 participants.

Administrative personnel in the Republic of Korea are required to participate in programs which enable them to upgrade their qualifications. The courses are offered at special training centers such as the Central Institute for Educational Administrators. Courses for principals and vice-principals are quite similar; both contain advanced teacher training courses, educational administration and finance, and extracurricular activities. The course for principals also has an additional study requirement in the area of school management.

Two further illustrations will serve to indicate the variety of policies which are pursued. Recently, an Institute of Education was created in Cyprus which will have responsibility for providing more systematic in-service training for teachers. The training of principals and vice-principals is considered to be part of this responsibility. In the Sudan, the Ministry of Education arranges for in-service courses for administrative personnel in schools and in the Ministry in collaboration with the Institute of Public Administration. The purpose of the course is to provide the trainees with the techniques and skills in teaching and administration. Senior educational administrators may also attend courses offered by foreign institutes.

A number of more specialized and permanent organizations for in-service and pre-service training merit more detailed description. From the various ones which might have been selected, four are described below. Three of these are in Latin America and one is in Asia.

Training Institute

The Instituto Superior de Educacion (ISE) was established in Paraguay in 1968 in an attempt to respond to the need for qualified teaching, administrative, and supervisory personnel. The specific objectives of ISE include the following: training teaching personnel and educational specialists, promoting in-service training, carrying out educational research, and developing teaching materials. The programs are carried out by a relatively small permanent staff which is supplemented by outside specialists who are involved on a part-time basis.

Specific courses offered by ISE include educational psychology, educational philosophy, theories and methods of teaching, and curriculum and instruction courses in various subjects. Courses particularly relevant to the training of administrators include those on the principalship (supervisory functions; the principal as leader; the principal and the community; the principal and human relations), school law (legal basis of school administration; teacher training; teachers' associations), school organization (organization of the Ministry of Education and Culture; organization of schools; internal organization; school and community), educational administration (the administrative process; supervision; budgeting), and educational planning (principles, techniques and methods of planning; planning education in Paraguay).

There are specific admission requirements for various programs including ability tests and tests of knowledge in relevant fields.

Applicants for the supervisor's program must hold principal's qualifications and must have held that post for at least three years with teaching experience of at least five years and not more than fifteen years. Applicants for the principal's program must have qualifications for normal school or primary teacher and have between five and fifteen years of teaching experience. Programs are taken over two years in four semesters; supervisors must complete an internship as part of their programs.

From 1969 through 1972 a total of 131 graduates had completed the programs for principals and supervisors. The forty-four graduates in 1972 included twelve principals and thirty-two supervisors.

Special Purpose Institute

The Instituto Superior de Educacion Rural (ISER) in Bolvia is dedicated to the socioeconomic improvement of the country through the technical improvement of rural education. Programs of the institute encompass the areas of teaching and research; the area of teacher improvement includes programs which permit specialization in administration. A proposal for the 1971 program provided for the admission of 150 post-graduate students comprised of one hundred principals and fifty supervisors.

General objectives of the program for principals and supervisors included the following: preparing personnel qualified in the techniques of organization, administration and supervision; providing in-service training for principals and supervisors; preparing principals and supervisors to provide maximum professional assistance to teachers; and stimulating principals and supervisors to work toward continuing improvement. These objectives were to be pursued through studies in three broad areas; the area of specialization, pedagogical studies, and complementary studies. Studies in the area of specialization included such subjects as supervision and administration while the pedagogical area included studies such as psychology, sociology, and community development. The complementary studies consisted of curriculum and instruction courses in specific subject matter areas.

The program was of ten months duration and was divided into trimesters. Emphasis in the work during the first trimester was on basic theoretical knowledge in the area of specialization. In the second trimester these studies were intensified, and activities were extended to include seminars and research activities. The third trimester provided for the continuation of the intensive work and for the addition of practical work in schools. The practical experience was seen as important for students to be able to test and validate the knowledge acquired in formal studies. It was also hoped that the experience would stimulate them to continue to apply theoretical knowledge and to work toward continuing improvement. During the latter stages of the program, provision was made for seminars which focussed on the analysis of problems related to the administration of rural schools and for the preparation of a thesis.

Training Center

The only institution which offers a formal training program for administrators and supervisors in Panama is the Instituto Centroamericana de Administration y Supervision de la Educacion (ICASE) which is located at the University of Panama. The establishment of ICASE grew out of the demand for better training of administrators and supervisors which resulted from the expansion of the educational system and the need for improvements in education. Three main types of work are carried out at ICASE: teaching, consultation, and research and publication. The teaching is provided through regular training courses of nine or ten months duration and through various short courses and seminars.

The regular training programs are based on certain principles which are reflected in the content of the program. One of these is that it is essential for administrators to bear in mind the socio-economic reality within which they must work. Furthermore, the operation of the educational system must be seen as part of that socio-economic reality. The importance of planning is also stressed in the training program.

Short training courses are organized for selected groups of administrators or specialsist and focus on the specific tasks of those groups. For example, if it is a group within the Ministry, the emphasis may be on some specific aspect of planning. Research which has been undertaken has included topics such as attitudes toward educational reform and failure rates in specific subjects.

An innovation which is being introduced involves developing programs for students who do not meet the requirements for admission to post-graduate programs. Main access to administrative and supervisory posts is still through teaching; consequently, most program participants are already in administrative or supervisory positions.

Preparation for Senior Administrators

The National Staff College for Educational Planners and Administrators in New Delhi has the mission of injecting a development orientation into the work of planners and administrators in place of the maintenance orientation which seems to characterize present administration. The main purpose of the college is to organize pre-service and in-service courses for senior administrative personnel in central and state ministries; however, courses will also be offered for university and college administrators and for those engaged in the training of teachers.

The specific functions of the National Staff College include the following:

- undertaking, promoting and coordinating research in educational planning and administration
- providing consultancy service to state governments and to other educational institutions
- acting as a clearinghouse of ideas and information on research and training
- providing facilities for training and research in educational planning and administration in other countries

The functions and programs are carried out through divisions of the College which focus on training, research and publications, extension services, university administration and Asian programs.

Research in the College will focus on studies such as comparisons of educational administration in different states, case studies of problems of management and organization, and personnel practices in administration. As has been mentioned, the training program will focus on senior personnel; training of lower level personnel will be left to the state institutes of education. Particular attention will be given to the training of district education officers.

The proposal for the College envisioned a variety of types of training programs geared to the particular clientele and the objectives of a program. The following were seen as possibilities:

- short conferences of three to five days for senior administrators to facilitate information exchange and sharing of experiences
- seminars and workshops of a longer duration for senior administrators on special topics
- three to four week or three to five month re-orientation and professional development courses for district education officers and university administrators
- courses of about one year's duration for newly inducted education officers, including internship experiences

Reports on the extent to which these programs have become operational were not available in view of the relatively short period of operation of the College.

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

From 1962 to the present, Unesco has been deeply involved in pioneering work in the training of educational planners and administrators both in Asia and in Latin America as well as in other developing areas. The programs have had a two-fold thrust in that they focused on the development of educational planning concepts and techniques as well as on the training of personnel who would apply the techniques. Specialists in planning as well as senior administrators who would be involved in the application of educational planning to policy development were involved in these training programs. A brief review of the experiences in Latin America and Asia will serve to illustrate the nature of this activity.

Latin America

In cooperation with other agencies, Unesco was associated with a total of seven training courses, one course-seminar, and at least five brief courses between 1962 and 1972 in Latin America. The seven training courses ranged from a minimum of ten weeks to a maximum of fifteen weeks duration while the seminars were from one week to three weeks in length. The majority of course participants were located in national ministries of education; however, there were also participants from primary, secondary and university levels.

The content of the training courses evolved over the years from a heavy emphasis on theoretical-conceptual content initially to a greater emphasis more recently on analyzing the operation of educational systems within a socio-economic context. Techniques used in the later courses tended to emphasize developing abilities to carry out the required analysis and for engaging in the programming of plan implementation. Some indication of the content of courses is also given by the specialists on the teaching staffs over the years; approximately

65 percent were specialists in educational planning, economists, and specialists in human resources development.

Asia

The Asian Institute for Educational Planning and Administration was established in 1962 under a ten-year agreement between the government of India and Unesco. The primary function of the Institute was to assist member states in the Asian region to prepare the key personnel needed for implementing the plan to provide compulsory primary education. In the ten-year history of the Institute it offered thirteen training courses for educational planners and administrators and two refresher training courses. It also held eleven regional seminars and conferences, awarded six senior fellowships, and assisted eleven member states in the organization of training programs.

The most important program of the Institute was the training course of five to six months in duration; two of these courses were for educational supervisors only while the others were for educational planners and administrators. A total of 296 participants from seventeen different countries were trained in the thirteen courses.

Reference might be made to the thirteenth course in order to provide some general indications of content and methodology. The major components of that course were theoretical studies, practical work, a planning exercise, term papers, special tutorials, seminars and study visits. As to methodology, there was continuation of earlier reliance on lectures, seminars and symposia; of these, the most common were the lecture method and discussions. Apparently, the heterogeneity of the groups was a continuing problem in identifying and applying an effective methodology.

Mathur has expressed a number of reservations about the total effectiveness of the courses. Some of the sources of difficulty appeared to lie in the low motivation of some of the participants and the inadequacy of follow-up activities; a further and related problem was the difficulty of establishing realism for the participants. The content of the course had to be general while the participants were concerned with unique characteristics of specific countries; these were not resolved satisfactorily.[1]

In addition to its specific courses and seminars, the Asian Institute also collaborated with national ministries in order to operate training courses for educational planners and administrators.

Other Programs

As an example of another cooperative program, mention might be made of the PNUD-Unesco-Chi 68-529 project in Chile. This program was sponsored by the United Nations Development Program and carried out by Unesco and the Ministry of Education in order to improve the training of educational administrators. More than 1,600 participants were involved in the forty training activities conducted during the years 1970, 1971 and 1972. The participants could be categorized into three main groups:

---

[1] M. V. Mathur, Review of the Training Programmes Organized by the Asian Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (New Delhi: National Staff College for Educational Planners and Administrators, 1973), pp. 22 - 29.

- administrators and planners in the service of the Ministry at the central, regional, provincial and local levels
- administrative personnel of education centers
- researchers in the fields of educational innovations and audiovisual instruction

The courses which were organized for these groups ranged in duration from one week to forty weeks.

UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS

Post-graduate study as a means of either pre-service or in-service training for administrators and supervisors is an established policy or accepted procedure in many countries. Some countries tend to rely on the programs available elsewhere, for good reasons, while others have developed their own. Kuwait, for example, has provided scholarships for teachers, headmasters, and others to pursue post-graduate courses in British and Arab universities. The courses pursued were in areas such as curriculum, school administration, education planning, and the teaching of subjects such as science. Thirty-five scholarships were awarded in 1972.

Saudi Arabia has established training courses for educational administrators -- personnel of the Ministry as well as Regional Education Directors, education officers, and headmasters-- with the assistance of some American universities. These courses are two years in duration and lead to a Master of Arts degree. A one-year course has also been established for headmasters of primary and intermediate schools. The annual intake for the former courses is about fifty and for the latter about seventy.

Inspectors of Primary Education in Cambodia are required to take a one year pre-service program in the Faculty of Education, and consideration is being given to the possibility of increasing this to a two-year program. Candidates are recruited from among teachers at the primary and secondary levels. The program consists of both practical and theoretical studies. In the theoretical area courses are taken in psychology, pedagogy, general culture, the culture and civilization of Cambodia, and administration and school law. The practical course consists of the inspection of primary schools. A total of over sixty inspectors had been trained in this program by 1973.

Graduate Programs

In an increasing number of countries, the study of educational administration is recognized as a legitimate field at the graduate level in universities. Programs are available at the pre-master's level, the master's level, the specialists level, and the doctoral level in different institutions. These programs provide opportunities both for the pre-service and the in-service training of administrators at all levels of the educational system. Such programs are firmly established in the United States and Canada; more recently, they have appeared in Australia, the United Kingdom and other countries. The programs are a means to appointment to administrative posts or promotions within the administrative hierarchy whether or not they are required for certification.

In general, the centers where programs are offered serve additional functions related to the development of educational administration such as research, publication, and consultative services.

The growth of graduate preparation programs is indicated by the experience in the United States where development has been stimulated by expansion of educational services and by certification requirements. In 1972 there were 362 institutions offering graduate programs in the area of educational administration; about 130 of these were offering programs at the doctoral level. In the period from 1940 to 1970 the most rapidly expanding program was the Specialists or two-year program while the least dramatic increases were for the Ph.D. program. Nevertheless, even the Ph.D. program increased in each decade. Both the Master's and the Ed.D. programs almost tripled in the period. Growth of programs is also indicated by the number of graduates. In the 1965 to 1970 period the number of graduates increased for doctoral programs by 71 percent and for the master's programs by 37 percent in the number of degrees awarded. In 1970 more than one thousand doctoral degrees were awarded in the specialization of educational administration.

Data collected by the University Council for Educational Administration indicated that even though there will be diminishing demand in the 1970's, the number of programs available will likely continue to expand.

The growth in Canada although not as great in terms of numbers has been almost more dramatic. In 1955 there were no clearly developed specialized programs in educational administration; studies in this area were conducted as part of specialization in the degrees offered in educational studies. By 1972, doctoral degrees were offered by nine universities and master's degrees by at least twenty-two. Although no data are available on graduates, the number of students in full-time attendance in 1972-73 in the programs in Canada included 245 master's and 71 doctoral candidates. Another 1,303 master's and 115 doctoral students were enrolled for part-time studies.

The content of graduate programs reflects considerable diversity of approaches to the organization of the substance of administrative studies. Some courses are based on disciplines such as sociology and economics, others relate to functions such as supervision and planning and still others may relate to posts such as the principalship or the superintendency. There are significant variations in practice relating to the total length of the program, residence requirements and other specific requirements. Most programs will permit specialization in selected aspects of administration and supervision.

Special Program

In 1972 the Faculty of Education of the University of Papua New Guinea instituted a course on Educational Administration in Developing Countries at a sub-graduate Diploma level. Twenty-two candidates were enrolled in the first two years.

The admission requirements include eligibility for admission at least on a provisional basis to the University, formal teacher training, three years of experience in teaching and nomination by the Education Department as having administrative potential. The candidates are sponsored by the Department of Education. Graduates have returned to or have assumed responsibilities at the district superintendent, inspector, and headmaster positions or levels.

The methods of instruction include group discussions, class presentations by students, role playing, case studies, simulations, field work, and independent studies. The specific courses taken in two semesters include theory and practice in educational administration (including three weeks of field work) basic studies in education, administration of education in Papua New Guinea, educational supervision, general seminars, and an advanced comprehension and composition course. Graduates are given nearly one year's credit toward a graduate degree if they are later admitted to such a program.

SUMMARY

Many educational systems have yet to develop formal preparation programs of an extended nature for educational administrators and supervisors. Some ministries do sponsor short pre-service and in-service programs either for certification or for preparation for a specific assignment; others seem to be involved in the organization and conduct of in-service training programs which range from a few days to a few weeks in duration. The topics included in these programs may be either very specific or of a more general nature.

A number of countries have found it useful to develop special centers for the pre-service or the in-service training of educational administrators and supervisors. Some specialized centers may be related to the development of new programs in education for which administrators required specialized training. International agencies have played an important role in the development of some centers for the training of administrators as well as in developing the field of study. University programs at the graduate level are becoming an increasingly accepted approach to preparation for administration; the number of programs at the master's and doctoral levels are increasing within the countries which have had them previously and are being developed in others.

The methods of instruction in these programs range from the traditional lecture to the use of modern instructional technology such as computer simulations. Many of the emerging practices hold substantial promise for increasing the effectiveness of training programs both at the pre-service and in-service stages.

CHAPTER VI

PROBLEMS AND ISSUES IN ADMINISTRATOR PREPARATION

The growing interest in preparation programs for educational administrators and supervisors suggests that there is an awareness of a need for action in an area where there has not been much to this time. In the first section of this chapter some of the sources of that need are examined; an attempt is made to support the point of view that administrator training programs both at the pre-service and in-service levels may be more important to the effectiveness of the educational system than they were previously. Training programs for administrators and supervisors are surrounded by many issues and unresolved problems. A selected number of issues are discussed in the second major section of the chapter. These are intended to indicate the nature of the challenge which confronts the designers of preparation and in-service programs.

NEED FOR TRAINING

Specialized preparation for administrators has long been overlooked, if not ignored, in many educational systems. In others the need for some form of preparation has been recognized but the efforts have been far less than what is required to provide an adequate supply of qualified personnel for administrative and supervisory posts. Recently the need for administrator training has been gaining increasing recognition. One of the reasons for this has been that the expansion of educational systems has brought to the fore administrative problems which were not evident in smaller, more isolated units. For various reasons it appears that the effectiveness of educational policies and programs depends to a considerable extent on the administrative component of the educational system.

Administration may indeed be more critical at certain times to the survival and functioning of a system than it is at other times. A review of some of the trends in education and the demands on administrators may serve to indicate that many educational systems may be experiencing pressures which place heavy demands on administrators. One source of these pressures resides in the changes which are taking place in the structure of the system itself including the increasing complexity brought about by the expansion of the system and increasing diversification. Other pressures are associated with trends toward centralization and decentralization as well as the moves toward increasing involvement of various groups in education. Furthermore, expectations are shifting for supervisory roles from emphasis on inspection to consultation, a change which appears to be compatible with the upgrading in the quality of the teaching force. Finally, changes and innovations in every aspect of education call for changes in administrative performance; each of these merits further elaboration.

Decentralization

In many educational systems there are indications of a move toward greater decentralization of one type or another. Basically, this involves a shifting of responsibility for various types of decisions or actions from upper to lower levels in the structure of the educational system. As a result, schools are looked upon as more important units for significant decisions along with the district or regional levels while central offices are engaged in shifting some areas of responsibility downward. The chief difference in the type of decentralization is that it can take two forms. In those educational systems which are centrally-controlled, the decentralization involves a greater emphasis on regional and local units for the implementation of policies; the policies may remain largely centrally-determined. In others, the decentralization may involve giving increased responsibility for the determination of policy to the lower levels.

The effect on administrators is the same in either case, namely, increasing demands on time and on skills. The routine demands are augmented by non-routine demands. The principal at the school level and the district education officer may be expected to exercise added responsibilities without additional training, at times without additional resources and without any lessening of the other responsibilities which consumed all of their time previously. If new structures are created in an effort to provide for the decentralization, new roles and relationships may prove to be disruptive; time and energy may be lost in learning how to work within the new structures. Some of these effects could be alleviated through suitable training or re-training of administrative and supervisory personnel.

Coordination of Systems

Even though some educational systems are becoming more decentralized, there appears to be a continuing demand for the coordination of all educational services. This demand may be particularly evident in the systems which traditionally have been centralized; however, it may also be evident in those in which the educational effort appears to have been fragmented and diffused. Not only may different parts of the educational system be expected to coordinate their efforts but there may also be a demand for educational services to be coordinated with other social services. When there exists this demand for coordination, the result may be increased centralized control. Administrators may find that while some decentralization brings them increased authority in certain spheres of their operation, they may have reduced autonomy in others. For example, one part of the educational system may be expected to be more innovative in its programming while it finds itself with reduced control over the budget which determines its ability to be innovative.

The demand for coordination may be particularly evident in the systems which traditionally have been highly decentralized. Uncoordinated efforts may have been acceptable and even rational under circumstances where there was a limited demand for educational services and where adequate resources were available for those services. When the demand increases and when resources become more scarce, an attempt may be made to introduce economies through increased coordination. As a result, administrators may be faced with new constraints and may find themselves subject to greater scrutiny than they were previously. An awareness of the need for greater coordination and adequate preparation of administrators should enable them to make more positive and functional responses to this demand for greater coordination of educational efforts.

Involvement

The roles and functions of administrators are being affected by the increasing involvement of various participants in the operation of the educational system and in the determination of policy. The trend toward the democratization of the administration of the educational system is evident in many countries. Increasingly, the involvement of the general public, parents, teachers and students in making educational decisions is gaining acceptance as a desirable aspect of the operation of the system. Some educational systems have made special provisions for the involvement of parents or other members of the public through the formation of advisory groups at national, regional or local levels. Administrative personnel are expected to be able to relate to and work with the public in a manner not expected before. This results in a demand for new skills and behaviors on the part of administrators.

Increasing involvement of teachers in educational decision-making is also evident in many systems. Teacher involvement may take numerous forms including representation on various decision-making bodies or the acceptance of responsibility for various categories of decisions by teacher groups. Sometimes it takes the form of unionization and results in the creation of strong bargaining groups which negotiate decisions that affect the working conditions and activities of teachers.

Administrators who do not understand the impact of the increased involvement on their roles may find themselves in conflict with some groups; yet such developments are frequently introduced without given administrators assistance in preparing for the changed conditions under which they will work. Such needs and others should be recognized in the design of in-service programs.

Control to Consultation

There is evidence in the reports on administrative practices in various countries of an ideological shift from control to consultation; the inspection function is being redefined as one which provides assistance to teachers rather than one which regulates through the enforcement of controls. Although the emphasis is supposed to result in a change in functions, supervisors and inspectors do not seem to be able to take on the new role without great difficulty. In part, the problem may be due to the difficulty which the supervisors or inspectors themselves experience in attempting to modify roles after long periods of performance in a particular way. Perhaps even though the emphasis is supposed to be changed, the persons who are being expected to change have not had sufficient preparation for making the adjustment. Another reason may be that while the ideology has changed, the demands made of inspectors might not have changed; an emphasis on consultation may be expected as an addition to the other responsibilities rather than as a change in responsibilities.

Provision of consultation services to teachers appears to be overshadowed by the same general problem in various educational systems. In brief this may be stated as follows: inspectors and supervisors are too few in number and do not have the time free from routine demands to provide consultation while principals do not have the training or the time to do so. The consequence of this is that those teachers who are most in need of consultation services are not likely to receive them. Something more than just a change in the statement governing the purposes of inspection is required if there is to be a change in practice; one essential additional element may be a new approach to the training of supervisors.

Quality of the Teaching Force

Reports from various countries indicate that the proportion of underqualified teachers in the teaching force is high. Under these circumstances the main task of inspectors and supervisors is to deal with the numerous problems associated with a teaching force which is low in professionalization. Many efforts of administrators are directed toward raising the level of teacher qualifications while supervisors are engaged in the task of assisting underqualified personnel to improve their performance. For the present, there is a need to train the administrators and supervisors to carry out these functions. As the teaching force becomes more highly qualified, there will be a need for supervisory personnel to adjust their roles. Supervisory behavior which contributes to improved performance by underqualified teachers may be resisted by teachers who believe that they are capable of making their own professional decisions. Changes in the quality of the teaching force suggest that there will be a need to modify the content of supervisor training programs and to provide in-service training for existing administrative and supervisory personnel.

This analysis suggests that any changes in the policy which governs the training of teachers should be accompanied by changes in the policy for the training of administrators and supervisors as well. Unless this occurs, there may develop internal frictions and dysfunctional practices which could reduce the effectiveness of the educational system. Unfortunately, the need to adjust policies governing administrator preparation are frequently overlooked in the drive to improve the quality of the teaching force.

Innovation

There appears to be a universal demand for changes and for innovations in education; administrators and supervisors are caught in the midst of actual and proposed changes. Areas in which change is either taking place or is proposed range from changes in the structure of the educational system and changes in curricula to demands for changes in technology and in access to education. At certain levels in the structure administrative personnel may be responsible for the identification of needed changes and for the determination of policies and procedures through which the changes might be effected. At other levels, administrators find themselves faced with the need to implement innovations and to make them work. Pressures may be brought to bear upon administrators and supervisors to introduce more changes than are proposed; at the same time, resistance to changes may find administrators faced with the task of convincing certain groups that proposed changes are desirable.

Emphasis on change and innovation has two major effects on the roles of administrators and supervisors. The first is that they are confronted with the need to acquire knowledge about the proposed innovations and to shift their behavior from maintaining established patterns in education to changing them. The second major consequence is that they must be prepared to respond to the proponents and the opponents of various innovations. Administrative life may become more political as a result of the emphasis on change. When changes fall short of the expectations of certain groups, administrators may bear some of the criticism. When there is resistance to change, administrators may be held accountable for not implementing policy. The difficulties associated with this situation will be compounded when the expectations of the public are not clear and the policies under which the educational system is governed remain vague or uncertain.

Training for administrators and supervisors may help them to cope with these emerging situations. An understanding of education and the role of education in society may be useful in identifying needed changes. The ability to analyze the present system of operation should also point to areas for improvement. Knowledge about the nature of organizations and change processes should help administrators to direct and implement change effectively. At the same time, an awareness of the political reality of education and educational organizations should contribute to the administrator's ability to cope with the various pressures which attend change and innovation.

SOME ISSUES IN ADMINISTRATOR TRAINING

The preceding section of this report has outlined some of the trends which accentuate the need for increased attention to the pre-service and in-service training of administrators and supervisors in education. Like so many other situations in which there is an awareness of a need, there is no ready solution to the problem of how to meet the need. The awareness leads first to the necessity of coping with some of the many issues which are associated with the training of administrators. These issues must be resolved in one way or another before it is possible to proceed with the development of an effective preparation program.

Only a few of the numerous possible issues can be discussed here. The first concerns the question: Who has the responsibility to provide preparation programs? A second major set of issues concerns the content of training programs, whether they are pre-service or in-service. Even once the content has been identified there still remains the matter of an appropriate strategy for teaching the content effectively. A very difficult question is: Who should become an administrator and how can he be identified? This question raises a variety of problems associated with recruitment and selection of administrators. These issues do not exhaust even the major ones but probably will serve as a sample of those which should be considered.

Responsibility for Training

The question of who should be responsible for the training of administrators has a number of equally acceptable different answers. Although some countries may have firmly established provisions for administrator preparation, there may still be alternatives when the expansion of training programs is considered or when some new types of programs are envisaged. Furthermore, since the preparation of administrators is shared by different agencies to some extent, the various alternatives may indicate differing degrees of emphasis on the distribution of responsibility for training across agencies. In this issue area as in all others the approaches adopted might also vary with the particular administrative or supervisory positions under consideration. Leaving the possible complicating variables aside for the moment, it seems that the alternatives for training include placing it in some established institution which probably has the responsibility for training of other educational personnel, making it the specific responsibility of the ministry or some branch of the ministry, or creating a specific purpose institution for the training of administrators. Of course, these alternatives are not mutually exclusive and may be used in differing combinations for different administrative and supervisory roles or stages of preparation.

It seems reasonable to suggest that preparation programs for administrative and supervisory posts which are close to the classroom and to the teacher are more likely to be the responsibility of the same institution as the one which has responsibility for teacher preparation. Those positions which are more closely associated with the ministry and its functions are more likely to be the responsibility of a certain branch of the ministry. There may, of course, also be a difference in responsibilities between pre-service and in-service education of administrators. Universities or teacher training colleges may have general responsibility for pre-service training for various posts while the ministry might be more directly involved in in-service training.

The creation of special purpose centers with the responsibility for administrator training is more likely to be the response when a determined thrust is desired for the improvement of the training of administrators or when it is related to more wide ranging changes in education which require massive re-orientation of administrative and supervisory personnel. In the area of in-service training of administrators there may be additional alternatives. One of these is that the professional associations of teachers or of administrators might engage in such programs; they might also involve cooperative efforts of a ministry, a university, and professional associations.

Whether the issue is the location of pre-service or of in-service programs, the response is likely to be some distribution of responsibility across a number of different agencies which might become involved. The search will be for an appropriate balance among the different areas of responsibility. The decision might be made, for example, that all administrators require a background of study in administration which can be obtained only through a university program. However, since each specific post requires specialized preparation this might involve the ministry in appropriate pre-service and in-service programs. As the practice of administration becomes more professionalized, the responsibility for the in-service development might be left increasingly to the initiative of individual or groups of administrators themselves.

Content of Training Programs

Issues surrounding the content of preparation programs demand resolution through a search for an appropriate balance among various desirable components. One aspect of the general problem concerns the extent to which the training program should focus on specific techniques which the administrator can apply immediately as opposed to more conceptual content which will enable him to grasp the broader significance of his work and to understand why certain techniques may or may not be appropriate. A response in favor of the latter approach results in a heavy emphasis on theoretical studies which is the characteristic of most university programs as opposed to the more applied nature of programs which are likely to be developed by program designers who tend to be more field oriented.

If the issue is resolved in favor of more applied, technique-orientated, immediately-relevant programs, the content will be determined to a large extent by what is known about the best of current practice. Although there may be differences of opinion about that practice, the content will tend to be derived from the experiences of administrators, and professors of educational administration are likely to have lengthy administrative experience. If the issue is resolved in specific circumstances in favor of more conceptually based studies, there is raised the problem of the source of those conceptualizations. Questions have been asked about the extent to which training for administrators in education can and should be similar to training for administrators in other institutional areas. What content is generalizable across administrative fields? What content is unique to administration in education? What aspects of administrative studies are multi- or inter-disciplinary? What aspects are unique to the field of administration? Many of the uncertainties about the content of programs are related to the problem of finding satisfactory answers to these questions.

As is true for other issues, the particular circumstances under which administrators work will determine, in part, what is considered to be appropriate content for training programs. Under conditions in which teachers lack adequate training and administrators are expected to be qualified in all aspects of education, a good grounding in educational studies is probably appropriate. In circumstances where the level of training of teachers is relatively high and where administration has become a more specialized function, more highly specialized content will likely be developed or adopted for administrative studies. When the emphasis shifts from preparing administrators who can maintain operations to preparing administrators who can formulate educational policies or who can assist with that process, then the perspectives which other disciplines and other fields of administrative study have to offer to the background of the prospective administrator become relevant.

Obviously, questions about the content of programs must be answered in terms of what the program is intended to do for the prospective administrator. In other words, for what types of activities is it intended to prepare him? How is his behavior to be modified? What should he be able to do after the completion of a program which he could not do before? Rational approaches to the selection of content and to program development require answers to these questions. It might be contended that no program could be developed without facing these issues; this need not be so. The difficulty of resolving the issues and the time-consuming nature of the process frequently leads program designers to rely very heavily upon the examples set elsewhere or on the availability of resources and materials which indirectly affect training programs. Content of programs is determined in numerous subtle and indirect ways; in spite of good intentions it is not always determined by the purposes for which programs were intended.

Method of Training

Content and method are related to some extent; however, any given content lends itself to presentation by a variety of methods and instructional strategies. As is true in all areas of formal study, there has been in the past, and still is at the present, a heavy reliance upon the lecture method in administrator training. This appears to be true in classes offered at universities, in conferences which administrators attend, in casual in-service activities and even in the more structured types of in-service programs. Probably the major variation is that lectures are supplemented occasionally by group discussions and similar activities. It is only recently that serious questions have been raised about the effectiveness of these methods for teaching administration and for influencing the behavior of administrators.

The questioning of traditional methods of training has resulted in the exploration of a number of alternatives. Among these are case studies which are designed to illustrate some of the reality of administration. By exposing the prospective administrators to reality-based problems an attempt is made to prepare them to engage in actual decision-making. More recently, attempts have been made to make the situations even more realistic through various types of simulations. The in-basket simulation presents the prospective administrator with a set of problems similar to those which might reach his desk. Responses are analyzed and may form the basis for discussions and evaluations. A more sophisticated design provides opportunities for the student to call for information, to propose various solutions to problems, and to receive feedback on consequences of his action by means of a computer program. Other developments include games and various types of laboratory training approaches which challenge the heavy reliance upon lecture methods as the chief strategy for attempting to help prospective administrators prepare themselves for their responsibilities. No doubt the training of administrators has the same potential for improvement through developments in methods and materials and in the application of technology as have other areas of teaching and professional training.

The guided field experience or internship is a component of training that remains to be fully explored and developed. Although most preparation programs include provisions for the possible inclusion of field experiences, there are few in which there is an integration of practical experiences and formal study. The reasons why this is not done probably reside in the difficulties of establishing relationships with the administrative units which might provide the experiences and in the lack of resources for such activities. Until these difficulties are overcome, little will be known about the extent to which administrative behavior can be learned from practicing administrators in field situations. It seems reasonable to propose that some very important learning can take place much more easily through field experiences than through more formalized activities.

Recruitment and Selection

Whether or not there are formal training programs for administrators, there must be some mechanisms for eliciting applications for administrative posts and some procedures for selecting from among the applicants. As is true for other areas of performance, the recruitment and selection process is crucial to the overall effectiveness of the administrative system. The selection of the right personnel will contribute greatly to reducing the need for and the cost of training programs; the selection of unsuitable personnel will contribute to the costliness and ineffectiveness of administrator preparation. In view of the importance of this aspect of administrative staffing, it is surprising that the activity receives so little attention and is treated as casually as it appears to be by most educational systems.

The issues which surround recruitment usually concern such specific questions as the pool from which administrators are selected. In general, this pool tends to be that of professional teachers; however, there are exceptions to this in most educational systems, no doubt, for specific types of posts. The closer the post is to the teacher and the classroom, the more likely it is to be held by a professional educator. There have been proposals to broaden this pool to include those who might not normally be considered; although this presents numerous problems, the assumption that only educators with long experience should be considered for administrative posts in education needs to be examined.

In most educational systems, administrative and supervisory posts carry sufficient prestige and other rewards to ensure that the number of persons who aspire to hold them is usually adequate. This, of course, does not necessarily mean that the most suitable persons are attracted to administrative posts. Even if they were, there are sufficient problems associated with selection to make it less than certain that the most suitable persons will be appointed. The effectiveness of recruitment and selection practices is difficult to assess because most of them are based on implicit rather than explicit policies; there is limited information available about how administrators and supervisors find their way into these positions.

Recruitment and selection should be based on some image of the ideal administrator or supervisor. This image of the administrator will vary with the type of educational system, with the particular challenges facing the system, with the level in the administrative structures, and with specific role responsibilites. The development of recruitment and selection procedures would be facilitated by the specification of expected personal characteristics, professional qualifications, and performance skills of administrators. This is seldom done in other than vague terms which form an inadequate base for developing criteria and for making selection decisions. The critical issues in administrator preparation include those associated with the development of realistic and valid selection criteria. Progress in this direction will depend upon the willingness of those who are responsible for the decisions to specify the performance expected of administrators. The task of identifying and selecting those who can be trained to perform as expected no doubt will prove to be a challenge to those who hold responsibility for administrator preparation.

Other Issues

The foregoing discussions do not exhaust the issues which are associated with the design of training programs; numerous other decisions must be made including those concerning the timing and length of programs. Timing involves specific questions such as which aspects of preparation can be completed some time before entry to an administrative position, what parts should be provided immediately before entry, and which might best be taken in-service. Similarly, decisions must be made about the length or duration of various programs and courses. An impression which emerges from a review of some of these programs is that much is attempted in a short period of time; the expectations of those responsible for such programs may be unrealistic.

As is true for other areas of professional training, the outcomes of a program are seldom specified. The assumption is that some exposure to content is better than none but beyond that there may be no clear indication of what the prospective administrator or supervisor is expected to be able to do after a period of training which he could not do before. The importance of indicating the objectives of a training program should not be overlooked.

Closely related to the preceding point is the need to carry out evaluations of courses and programs. The introduction of various approaches to training should raise the question of determining whether the approach is effective under various conditions for various groups of trainees. Such systematic evaluation should form the basis for future program improvements.

SUMMARY

A number of trends and developments in education are accentuating the need for the specialized training of administrators and supervisors. Among the factors which are serving as a stimulus to the development of preparation programs are the improvements in the quality of the teaching force, the demand for changes in policy and innovation in education, and structural changes in the educational system. Educational systems cannot respond effectively to these demands and developments without properly trained administrative personnel.

The desire to introduce changes and improvements in the preparation of administrators brings to the surface numerous issues surrounding training, selection, appointment, and personnel policies in general. Before a preparation program can be implemented or improved questions of who should do the training, what should be the content of the training, and how the trainees are to be selected must be answered. Any attempt to introduce new programs or to change programs will require at least tentative answers to these questions. Decisions must be made about the extent to which universities, teacher training colleges and other agencies will be involved in the pre-service and in-service training. Analyses will also have to be carried out about the content and method of training as well as about the selection of the people to take the training. Answers already developed to these questions in some educational systems should be reviewed as carefully as those being considered by the systems which as yet have not developed strategies for coping with problems of administrator preparation.

CHAPTER VII

DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

A review of existing practices and a discussion of some of the issues which surround the preparation of administrators and supervisors would be incomplete without an attempt to identify some proposals and to present some recommendation about the issues which require further attention within this area of concern. The proposals address some desirable and necessary developments; they are based partly on some ideas current in the literature and partly on impressions gained from carrying out this study. Any set of recommendations is not likely to be endorsed by all who have studied or observed a particular field of endeavor; these are no exception. The recommendations are intended to serve as a point of departure for further discussion, study, and perhaps eventual action. They are not intended to be prescriptions which can be implemented without critical examination. Indeed, the greater the critical examination to which they are subjected, the more likely it will be that some useful outcomes may result.

PROPOSALS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Fourteen specific recommendations or proposals are presented under four major headings. These identify the recommendations as grouped under those which relate to administrative structure, those which relate to administrative roles and functions, those which concern training policies, and finally, those which bear specifically on training programs.

Administrative Structure

The organizational contexts within which educational administrators and supervisors work are highly varied. Administrative structures range from those in which there is only a single level above the school to those in which there may be four or even more. National governments may carry sole responsibility for education or they may be excluded almost entirely from the operation of educational systems in countries where education is a state or a provincial responsibility. Local authorities may be actively engaged in the control of education and in policy formation or they may have only a minimal advisory role, if they exist at all. These variations in design are ample evidence that educational activities can be carried out under a variety of administrative structures. But the fact that all of them seem to work does not mean that any one would be appropriate under all circumstances or that each one is effective at present. Some of the structures may make the task of administrators and supervisors manageable while others may present significant obstacles to individual performance and to the effectiveness of the administrative component of the system.

Any strategies for changing or improving the performance of administrators and supervisors should begin logically with an examination of the structures within which they are expected to function. Attempts to improve or modify the performance of individuals without appropriate modifications in the structure of the organization may lead only to frustration, strain, conflict and inefficiency. Structural modifications may even serve to correct some of the problems which now appear to be due to the inadequacies of individuals who have particular responsibilities within the system. Before attempts are made to change the individuals, some analysis should be made of the administrative structure.

A critical examination of administrative organization might begin with questions such as the following:

1. What functions are presently being carried out at national, state, regional and local levels?
2. Is the administrative structure at each level appropriate for the performance of these functions?
3. Do communications and information flow without difficulty from level to level? Is the coordination adequate?
4. What changes might be desirable in both the functions and structures at each level, across levels and within various units?

Of course, there are no universal criteria against which the adequacy of any administrative structure can be assessed. The relative merits of particular structures and particular allocations of functions are matters of judgment, and judgments will vary. Nevertheless, it is possible that several observers may agree that there are some inadequacies in the operation of a system and when they do it will be likely that some major administrative problems have been identified. If no problems are identified through raising these types of questions and through an examination of indicators that should not require a highly rigorous specification, then the administrative structure would seem to be adequate for the circumstances. Changing it would probably make little difference. The situations which require attention are those in which the difficulties are easy to document; it is under these circumstances that structural modifications are more likely to be effective than would the retraining of personnel without organizational changes.

The discussion of administrative structures and of the functions assigned to various levels in different systems presented earlier in this report could serve as a point of departure for examining particular systems; comparisons across systems might serve to indicate the range of variations which are possible and might suggest some alternatives for distributing functions. Furthermore, a general comparison might lead to more critical appraisal which would deal with specific questions such as the following:

1. Are various functions being carried out and various decisions made at the most appropriate level? Is the central agency engaged in those activities and functions which are most appropriate for that level? Are lower levels in the system assigned appropriate responsibilities?
2. Should responsibility for some decisons be shifted to lower levels? Is the educational system too highly centralized? Should there be greater public involvement at local levels or should the extent of this involvement be reduced?
3. Does there appear to be a need for greater central coordination? Is the system too fragmented?
4. Are there indications that the educational system is too highly bureaucratized? Are there too many levels in the structure? Do communications flow through too many offices? Are there bottlenecks in the information flows?

These questions are presented only as a sample of the type which might be asked; other more specific ones might be raised. The most crucial questions surrounding any system may come to light only after such an examination is initiated.

The importance of these questions to the performance of administrative and supervisory personnel probably does not require elaboration. On the assumption that administrative structure and administrative performance are related, it is recommended that:

> *The administrative structures of educational systems at national, state, and local levels should be reviewed periodically.*

Reviews of the type envisaged could have a number of highly desirable outcomes. The first is that some dysfunctional features of the system might be identified and that the possibilities for change and improvement might become evident. A second desirable outcome might be that those working within the structure would be stimulated even if no need for major changes were identified. The likelihood of these desirable outcomes actually occuring would be increased if the review were not completely an internal matter but included personnel from outside the level which was being reviewed. Deliberate inclusion of members in a review team from structures which have adopted quite different designs might itself be an impetus for some changes.

The recommendation proposed above is perhaps more relevant if it is assumed that educational systems are stable and fairly static. Although this may be true for some systems, it would certainly not be true for all or perhaps even many. Accordingly, it is important to present another recommendation which is relevant for those systems which are undergoing structural changes:

> *Administrative and supervisory personnel should have the opportunity to learn about impending structural changes and should receive assistance in preparing for those changes.*

Unless such opportunities are provided, the change may have unintended disruptive effect on the operation of the system; indeed, it may even be subverted by those who do not understand the reasons for the change or the intended outcomes. Provision for in-service training of the members of a system may increase the probability that the changes will prove to be effective and beneficial.

The importance of the distinctive features of administrative structures is frequently not reflected in the content of training programs for administrators and supervisors. At times the training programs experienced by individuals may be set in the context of an educational system which is totally different from theirs. In other instances a preparation program may be conducted at a general level which tends to de-emphasize the differences among systems. Although there are general concepts in the study of administration, it seems inadvisable to carry on all training at this general conceptual level. Accordingly, it seems reasonable to propose that:

> *Administrator and supervisor training programs should include components which are directed toward preparing the trainees to work in a particular type of system.*

This is not intended to imply that the prospective administrator should not learn about other systems or be able to analyze critically the one in which he will be working. The statement means only that if training is to be effective it must take into account both the unique as well as the general features of administrative responsibilities. For an administrator, the administrative structure in which he will work is an important aspect of the uniqueness of his situation; overlooking and ignoring the organizational realities is a disservice to the prospective administrator.

If the importance of the structure of a system is taken into account, both for purposes of designing training programs and for specifying administrative roles, at least some of the problems which confront administrators may be overcome. In order for an administrator to be able to carry out his responsibilities and to be able to work with other members of the system, he must have a clear understanding of the interrelationships which exist. Consequently, training programs should provide him with relevant understandings and with the sensitivity to the organization which will enable him to analyze organizational problems.

Functions, Roles, and Standards

The variety of administrative structures in education is reflected in the varied functions and roles which are encompassed by the general designations of administrator or supervisor. Administrators and supervisors may have functions which range all the way from the determination of policies for an entire system to the narrow task of ensuring that detailed regulations in a small sector of the operation of that system are being followed. Although there may be common elements in the work of those who discharge these varied responsibilities, it is easy to overlook the important differences, particularly as these relate to training programs. In view of these variations,it seems highly important to bear in mind the different training needs of policy makers, of the technical experts who advise policy makers, and of those who see to the implementation of that policy. Accordingly, it is recommended that:

> *Training programs for administrators and supervisors should be differentiated in part, on the basis of specific functions to be performed and level in the system at which these will be performed.*

The recommendation is that training even for similar posts such as those of supervisor and inspector should be differentiated to some degree; yet, differentiation could easily be carried to an undesirable extent. Some portion of the training program, perhaps the major portion, should be common. Among the reasons for common preparation is the possibility that it forms the basis for effective working relationships. Obviously, there would be agreement that content which bears on the general structure of education, on educational policies, and on educational programs can and should be common to the preparation of most prospective administrators and supervisors.

An attempt has already been made to present a case for carrying out periodic reviews of the administrative structures of particular systems; this review should include an examination of specific administrative roles and the interrelationships among roles at particular levels. Formal statements about responsibilities of various administrative and supervisory personnel vary greatly in specificity. At one extreme they tend to be vague, abbreviated, and general while at the other extreme they may be too specific, lengthy, and elaborated to the point where they are unrealistic. From the vagueness and generality of some statements as well as from the length of others, it appears that the expectations for the performance of many administrators and supervisors are unrealistic. Too much is expected of too few people in too short a time. Some attempt to define and redefine roles and responsibilities may be highly important since individuals have only a limited amount of time, energy, and skill. It is likely that an administrator who is charged with the task of administering a budget, supervising physical facilities, and assisting teachers individually along with curriculum development and community development is more than likely to be ineffective in at least one of these areas. If he attempts to be thorough in all of them, he may find himself faced with an impossible task.

Time is not the only problem. Some of the functions assigned to administrators or supervisors may be incompatible; for example, the regulatory functions of some administrators may conflict with their advisory roles. Certain general functions or specific activities might be ignored not because the incumbent of a position is incapable of carrying them out but because he is unable to resolve a conflict among his responsibilities. In view of this real or potential problem, it is proposed that:

Administrative and supervisory roles should be analyzed critically, and reasonable expectations should be formulated for specific roles at various levels.

Clarification of roles can lead to some immediate relief for those who are now attempting to discharge broad functions in too many areas. At the same time, these revised role expectations might be useful as the basis for determining some of the content of pre-service preparation and in-service training programs.

A critical examination of roles might also tend to verify or to refute the contention that routine demands on the time of administrative personnel tend to drive out the non-rountine demands. The preparation of standard detailed reports by inspectors may keep them from attending to important consultation and program development activities. If this is indeed the case, a number of possible solutions can be identified which include reducing the demand for detailed reporting, assigning the routine responsibility to other agencies, or not assigning the new responsibilities to the same person. It is probably easier to assign new functions to the same roles than to remove existing functions. A supervisor may be asked to take on new responsibilities in areas such as community development even though his time was fully taken up by other responsibilities previously. Furthermore, the additional demand may come about without opportunities for preparing for the new responsibilities.

A critical examination of structure and of role responsibilities might reveal that new roles need to be created for emerging functions. As circumstances change, new roles may need to be defined while others should be phased out. Accordingly, it is recommended that:

> *Redefinition of administrative and supervisory functions should include the addition and deletion of roles and positions in response to the changing needs of the system.*

Such adjustments will accentuate the need for either in-service or pre-service training programs. The changes which are taking place, or which should be taking place in the system, may require the development of new types of specialization in preparation programs.

Closely related to the issues which surround roles and functions is the one which concerns the numbers of personnel in administrative and supervisory posts. Although the charge is often made that the size of the administrative and supervisory component is too large in relation to the total number of personnel, the charge is hard either to corroborate or to refute. It could well be that the number of non-teaching personnel may be too high in a particular system or that the numbers may be higher than necessary at a particular level. However, this does not seem to be the case with regard to inspectors and supervisors. In most systems, the ratio of teachers to supervisors appears high and probably is too high given the circumstances under which the work is being carried out. Since there does appear to be an unfavorable ratio, it is proposed that:

> *Realistic standards for the numbers of administrative and supervisory personnel at various levels and in various geographic areas of an educational system should be established.*

These standards will vary from system to system because of variations in the qualifications of the teaching force, the functions assigned to various posts, the concentration of population and other factors. In spite of these variations, some comparative analyses would probably be helpful to those who will have the responsibility for determining the standards.

Training Policies

One observation which seems to be valid for most educational systems is that the policies which govern the recruitment and the training of administrative and supervisory personnel are seldom clearly outlined. The statements which are available on these policies, and few are available, tend to be vague and general; those which are clear and precise form the exception. For reasons which are difficult to understand, educational systems at the national, state, and local levels have been slow to explicate policies about the training and selection of those members of the system who presumably will be the most influential group in the determination of policy or in giving advice on the formulation of that policy. Either as part of the review of administrative structure and the roles of administrators, or independently, it is proposed that:

> *Educational systems at the national, state, and local levels should undertake a comprehensive review of their policies on the recruitment, selection, training, placement, and development of administrative and supervisory personnel.*

Hopefully, a review of the present situation would lead eventually to the development of more explicit statements of policy governing these areas of decision-making. Those statements may be some time in emerging because the first step is one of sensitizing administrators to the need for working toward the development of such policies.

The examination of present practices in general should result in the identification of some problems in specific areas, for example, areas such as the requirements for appointment to administrative posts and for certification. An examination of the stated requirements for appointment at present indicates that there is heavy reliance on factors such as university degrees, teaching qualifications, and experience. The rationale which lies behind the use of these criteria is seldom specified. Indeed, the criteria may not even be valid; the consistent application of the criteria might inhibit rather than facilitate the development of the system if they are related at all to the performance of the individual as an administrator. Even though the task would be surrounded by numerous problems, it is proposed that:

> *Criteria presently used for selection of administrators and supervisors should be tested for validity. Attempts should be made to define different and perhaps more valid indicators of desired future performance.*

One of the specific challenges in such an endeavor would be to specify the kind of behavior expected of administrators and then to work back to the identification of factors which would predict that performance.

Although it seems worthwhile to propose the research mentioned above, it is not all that certain that it would be useful in making specific decisions on selection and appointment. Perhaps this is best viewed as a process of successive approximations. General criteria or requirements may be specified and may even be validated through empirical studies; however, this will do little more than define the pool from which appointments can be made in specific cases. At the level where the appointment or selection decision is made, more attention needs to be given to specific criteria which will indicate the applicant's suitability for a specific position. These criteria will be highly variable and may not be subject to specification in policy or to validation through survey research or sample studies.

An unresolved issue in this general area concerns whether or not there should be formal certification as part of the policy on the training of administrators. At present there are examples of systems which have and of those which do not have certification of administrators. This is understandable because it has both desirable and undesirable consequences. On the one hand certification does serve to regularize and to control the entry of persons into practice and can be used to improve quality in terms of professional preparation. Certification can also change preparation programs or practices if these are thought to be deficient and can force the introduction of new approaches or content. To the extent that the requirements for certification may not be rationally determined, there may be inappropriate specification of content. If the specifications are too rigid they may inhibit the development of desirable innovations in preparation programs. The argument in favor of a certification requirement seems to be strong since there is a desire in most systems to raise qualifications; therefore, it is recommended that:

> *Certification of administrators should be considered as one strategy for raising the level of professional preparation of administrators and supervisors. Systems which have had a certification requirement for some time might be advised to undertake a review of the requirements.*

With respect to the formal training requirement which will probably be one component of certification, it is hoped that this can be kept flexible so that improvements in programs can be developed without lengthy delays to the detriment of the quality of preparation programs.

Training Programs

The pressures which were discussed in the preceding chapter have resulted in a growing awareness of the need for improvements in training programs for administrators and supervisors. In many instances this awareness has resulted in the development of pre-service and in-service programs where none existed previously. The growing need for administrators and supervisors in education creates the demand for new opportunities for pre-service training while the changes in the system create the need for in-service training opportunities for present and future administrators. In view of these trends, and due to the fact that uncoordinated training efforts are not likely to be effective, it is recommended that:

> *Educational authorities at all levels should give high priority to the development of pre-service and in-service training programs for administrative personnel.*

An effective total program would include adequate opportunities for pre-certification or pre-service and in-service training opportunities. The development of effective policy and programs requires that deliberate attention be given to this task. Therefore, it is recommended further that:

> *Responsibility for the determination of policies and of programs, and for the coordination of training efforts, should be assigned*

to a specific office or unit at each administrative level which has an involvement in administrator training.

The responsibility might be placed with a specific unit in the ministry or with specific individuals at the local or regional level in a system. Advice on policy, the development of alternatives, and the coordination of efforts would be the responsibility of this office.

In part, the responsibility of the office specified above would be to outline what alternatives exist for the development of training programs. The general ones have been mentioned previously: assigning it to members of the ministry or to other administrative units at lower levels, considering it to be a responsibility of universities, assigning it to professional associations, or creating special centers to provide training programs. In all probability, the plan will include a number of these; members of the ministry might be trained through international programs, graduate degree programs might be encouraged at universities, and in cases where major changes are envisaged for education, special centers may have to be created for providing the necessary training for administrative personnel. University-based centers might have a number of functions including administrator training, furthering the field of study, and carrying out research which would be of value to policy makers within the educational system.

The preceding chapter of this report has dealt with some of the issues which surround the training of administrators. Some of these issues must be resolved by decision-makers before a program of training can be introduced or changed; others are continuing issues which are never completely resolved. The struggle with these continuing issues gives the impetus for change and for improvements in training programs. Some of these issues are amenable to research and to analysis through evaluative studies. The approaches to the evaluation of instructional programs are as applicable to the training of administrators as they are to any other area of instruction. Since there probably has been too little program evaluation, it is proposed that:

> *Those who have responsibility for training programs should give specific attention to the evaluation of the total program and to specific aspects such as content and instructional methods.*

Perhaps these two specific areas, content and method, are basic to the effectiveness of programs. Continued attention to them should lead to some promising developments.

Considerable impetus for the development of training programs has come from international exchanges, discussions, and programs. Particular mention should be made of the training programs sponsored by Unesco and by the International Institute for Educational Planning and various cooperating nations and agencies. A series of international intervisitation programs has also been organized initially under the sponsorship of the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) composed of member universities in the United States and Canada. The 1974 program in Great Britain was organized through the cooperation of the British Educational Administration Society, the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration, and UCEA. Activities of this type hold promise for continuing stimulation to the development of educational administration as a field of study and of practice. Consequently, it is recommended that:

> *International cooperation in administrator training and in the development of administrative studies in education should be continued and expanded where possible.*

The development of the professional preparation of administrators and supervisors in education probably depends to a considerable extent upon the continuation of international activities.

CONCLUSION

The major conclusion which results from this exploratory study is that the policies which relate to administrator preparation and appointment are important but relatively undeveloped areas of research. Review of the documentary materials on which this report is based revealed many specific questions which merit much more detailed study. In order to further knowledge in this area, different research methodologies must be combined with more focused studies. Among those which might hold considerable promise are studies such as the following:

- detailed descriptions of policies and practices on selected topics prepared by researchers who are familiar with practices in specific countries
- questionnaire studies developed around some of the themes identified in this report but carried out on a sampling basis within and across countries
- comparative case studies to assess the consequences

of different policies in different systems

- evaluations of policies and practices which govern the recruitment, selection, training, and appointment of administrative and supervisory personnel

Perhaps the most productive approach to these studies might be through having them planned by a team comprised of members from a number of educational systems; the actual studies could either be carried out by the team or by researchers in the individual cooperating countries.

Another useful development might be the preparation of guidelines for the collection of data which are required for the rationalization of policies in the area of administrator training and appointment. Some important data may be available even now but not in a form or at a time when it is required for making decisions. Ministries require data on the availability of administrative and supervisory personnel and data about possible future needs both in terms of numbers as well as the skills and the competencies of personnel. Studies in the areas of data needs, procedures for the collection of data, and procedures for the development of policies would prove to be valuable for many educational systems either for assessing their own practices or for initiating new policies.

Some problems cannot await either the development of more systematic approaches to the collection and storing of information or the development of further research. This review of current practices has identified some areas in which immediate action by local authorities, state or national ministries, those engaged in the preparation of administrators, or administrators and supervisors themselves may be desirable. The purpose of this report will have been achieved if members of any of these groups are stimulated to direct their attention toward improved practices in the training of administrative and supervisory personnel.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

DOCUMENTS USED IN PREPARATION OF REPORT

National Reports

The following National Reports were presented to the 34th Session of the International Conference on Education at Geneva in September, 1973.

Algeria (République Algerienne Démocratique et Populaire). *Rapport sur le Mouvement Éducatif*. Ministère des Enseignements Primaire et Secondaire, 1973.

Argentina. *Informe de la Republica Argentina*. Ministerio de Cultura y Educacion, 1973.

Australia. *Organisation of Education in 1971-1973*.

Austria. *Organization of Education in 1971/73*. Federal Ministry of Education and Arts, 1973.

Bahrain, State of. *A Report on the Development in Education in Bahrain 1971-1973*. Ministry of Education, 1973.

Belgium. *Quelques Aspects du Mouvement Éducatif de 1971 à 1973*. Rapport des Ministères de L'Éducation Nationale et de La Culture, 1973.

Cambodia (République Khmere). *Rapport Sur L'Évolution de L'Éducation de 1971 à 1973*. Ministère de L'Éducation Nationale, 1973.

Cameroon. *L'Évolution de L'Éducation au Cameroon de 1970 à 1973*.

Canada. *The Organization of Education in Canadian Provinces*. Council of Ministers of Education, 1973.

Cuba. *Organizacion de la Educacion 1971-1973*. Direccion de Produccion de Medios de Ensenanza, 1973.

Cyprus, Republic of. *Report on the Organization of the Cyprus Education System over the Last Two Years 1971-1973*. Ministry of Education, 1973.

Egypt, Arab Republic of. *Major Trends in Educational Development in 1971/72 and 1972/73 in A.R.E.* The National Centre for Educational Research, 1973.

Finland. *Organization of Education in Finland in 1971-1973*. Ministry of Education, 1973.

France. *Le Mouvement Éducatif en France 1971-1973*. Ministère de L'Éducation Nationale, Institut National de Recherche et de Documentation Pédagogiques, 1973.

Germany, Federal Republic of. *Organization of Education 1971-1973*. Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Culture of the Lander of the Federal Republic of Germany, 1973.

Ghana. *Report on Organization of Education in 1971-1973*. Ministry of Education, 1973.

India. *Report on Educational Developments in India 1972-73*. Ministry of Education and Social Welfare, 1973.

Indonesia. *Indonesian Educational Development 1969-1973*. Ministry of Education and Culture, 1973.

Iran. *Report on Educational Development in 1971-73*. Ministry of Education, 1973.

Iraq, Republic of. *A Report on Educational Development in Iraq 1969/70 - 1971/72*. Ministry of Education, 1973.

Ireland. *The Organization of Education in Ireland during 1971/73*. The Department of Education, 1973.

Italy, Republic of. *The Educational Movement in 1971-1973*. Ministry of Public Education, 1973.

Ivory Coast, Republic of. *Rapport sur L'Évolution de L'Éducation en Cote D'Ivoire de 1971 à 1973*. Ministère de L'Éducation Nationale, 1973.

Japan. *Organization of Education in Japan 1971-1973*. Japanese National Commission for Unesco, 1973.

Kenya. *Developments of Education in Kenya in 1971-73*. Ministry of Education, 1973.

Korea, Republic of. *Report on Educational Developments*. Ministry of Education, 1973.

Kuwait, State of. *Organization of Education in 1971-1973*. Ministry of Education, 1973.

Lebanon. *Le Mouvement Éducatif au Liban 1971-1973*. Ministère de L'Éducation Nationale et des Beaux-Arts, 1973.

Liberia. *Major Trends in Liberian Education 1971-1973*. Ministry of Education, 1973.

Libyan Arab Republic. *A Concise Report on Educational Developments in the Libyan Arab Republic During the Period from 1971 to 1973*. National Commission for Education, Science and Culture, 1973.

Monaco. *Rapport sur L'Évolution de L'Enseignement en 1972 et 1973*. Department de L'Interieur, Direction de L'Éducation Nationale, 1973.

Netherlands. *Major Trends in Educational Development in the Netherlands*. Ministry of Education and Science, 1973.

New Zealand. *Education in New Zealand 1971-1973*.

Nigeria, Federal Republic of. *Government Report to International Conference on Education*. Federal Ministry of Information, 1973.

Pakistan. *Education in Pakistan 1971-73*. Central Bureau of Education, Ministry of Education, 1973.

Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of. *The Bi-Annual Report of the Ministry of Education (1971-72) and (1972-73)*. Ministry of Education, 1973.

Senegal. *Apercu General sur L'Évolution de L'Éducation au Senegal*.

Sierra Leone. *Report on Developments in Education in Sierra Leone* 1971-1973.

Singapore. *Organization of Education in 1971-1973*.

Spain. *International Conference on Education: Report on Educational Reform in Spain*. Ministry of Education and Science, 1973.

Sudan, Democratic Republic of the. *Organization of Education 1972-73*. Ministry of Education, The Educational Documentation Centre, 1973.

Switzerland. *L'Enseignement en Suisse*. Centre Suisse de Documentation en Matiere D'Enseignement et D'Éducation, 1973.

Syrian Arab Republic. *A Report on the Development of Education in the Syrian Arab Republic During 1971-1972 and 1972-73*. Ministry of Education, 1973.

Thailand. *Report of Educational Development 1971-1973*. Ministry of Education, 1973.

Tunisia, Republic of. *Rapport sur le Mouvement Éducatif en Tunisie 1971-1973*. Ministère de L'Éducation Nationale, 1973.

Uganda, Republic of. *Educational Development in 1971-72 in the Republic of Uganda*. The Uganda Commission for Unesco, 1973.

United Arab Emirates. Education in U.A.E. Ministry of Education, 1973.

United Kingdom. Report on the Organisation of Education in the United Kingdom 1971-1973.

United States of America. Progress of Education in the United States of America: 1970-71 and 1971-72. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1973.

Vietnam, Republic of. Educational Developments 1971-1973. Ministry of Culture, Education and Youth, 1973.

Other Documents

Asian Institute of Educational Planning and Administration. Director's Report, Thirteenth Course for Educational Planners and Administrators. New Delhi: Asian Institute for Educational Planning and Administration, 1972.

Asian Institute of Educational Planning and Administration. Information Guide, XIII Training Course for Educational Planners and Administrators. New Delhi: Asian Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, 1972.

Asian Institute of Educational Planning and Administration. Special Training Course for Indonesian Educational Administrators. New Delhi: Asian Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, 1972.

Asian Institute of Educational Planning and Administration. The Role, Function, Recruitment and Training of District Education Officers. New Delhi: Asian Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, 1970.

Austria (No Author). "The Role of the Inspectorate in Austria." n.d. (Mineographed.)

Baron, G. Society, Schools and Progress in England. London: Pergamon Press, 1965.

Bergen, J. J. The Alberta Leadership Course for School Principals: A History and an Evaluation. Edmonton: Department of Educational Administration, The University of Alberta, 1972.

Bolivia. "Plan de Estudios Para el Curso de Directores y Supervisores Para la Gestion de 1971." Tarija: Instituto Superior de Educacion Rural, 1973. (Mimeographed.)

Cameroon, United Republic of. The Reform of Primary Education in Cameroon. Final Report of the Seminar for Administrative and Political Cadres. Yaounde: Ministry of National Education, 1973.

Chile. "Investigacion Acerca de la Organizacion Administrativa del Sistema Educacional." Santiago: Ministerio de Educacion, Oficina de Planificacion y Presupuesto, March, 1973. (Mimeographed.)

Chile. Programa Integrado de los Cursos Comunes. Rinconada de Maipu: Ministerio de Educacion, n.d.

Council of Ministers of Education, Canada. Annual Report of the Secretary General. Toronto: Council of Ministers of Education, 1973.

Culbertson, Jack, and others. Preparing Educational Leaders for the Seventies. Final Report on Project No. 8-0230 submitted to the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1969.

de Fábrega, Angela A. "Nuevo Curriculum del ICASE: Una Experiencia en Formacion de Administradores y Supervisores de la Educacion." Paper prepared for participants in the Seminar on "The Training of Specialists in Educational Administration and Planning: Evaluation and Prospects," Paris, July 2-11, 1973.

Diowvilai, Boonarg. "Problems Involved in the Educational System in Thailand." Edmonton: Department of Educational Administration, The University of Alberta, 1973. (Mimeographed.)

Educational Research Service. "Preliminary Information for 1973 Certification Manual (NEA)," 1974. (Mimeographed.)

Farquhar, Robin H. "New Directions in the Content of Canadian Preparation Programs for Educational Administrators." Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, May 29-30, 1973.

Gambia. Education in Gambia. Bathurst: Department of Education, 1970.

Gar, J. K. "The Development of Primary Education in Nigeria." Edmonton: Department of Educational Administration, the University of Alberta, 1973. (Mimeographed.)

Guruge, Ananda W. P. A Functional Analysis of Educational Administration in Relation to Educational Planning. IIEP Occasional Papers No. 16. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning, 1969.

Henderson, Algo D. *Training University Administrators: A Programme Guide*. Paris: Unesco, 1970.

Holdaway, E. A. *Comparative Analysis of Administrative Structures of Educational Systems in Australia and Canada*. Edmonton: Department of Educational Administration, The University of Alberta, 1973.

ICASE. "Algunos Aspectos de la Formacion de Administradores y Supervisores de la Educacion en Panama," 1973. (Mimeographed.)

International Intervisitation Programme. *Third International Intervisitation Programme on Educational Administration, 6th-27th July, 1974*. Armidale, Australia: Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration, 1974.

Kenya. *Teacher Education Bulletin*, 1967-1968 Issue.

Kurnap, J. J. "Some Problems of Unplanned Educational Expansion in Nigeria." Edmonton: Department of Educational Administration, 1973. (Mimeographed.)

Liberia, Republic of. "Requirements and Procedures for the Certification of Educational Personnel in the Republic of Liberia." Ministry of Education, May, 1972.

Lulla, B. P. and S. K. Murty. *Essential Problems of Indian Education*. Agra: Lakshmi Narain Agarwal, 1971.

Mathur, V. S. (ed.). *Crucial Problems in Indian Education*. New Delhi: Arya Book Depot, 1970.

Mathur, M. V. *The Social, Educational, Economic and Political Aspects of Administering Educational Planning*. Occasional Papers No. 39. New Delhi: Asian Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, 1970.

Mathur, M. V. *Review of the Training Programs Organized by the Asian Institute of Educational Planning and Administration*. New Delhi: National Staff College for Educational Planners and Administrators, 1973.

Medard, Robert. "Unite Technique de Formation D'Administrateurs de L'Éducation au Chili." Paper prepared for the seminar organized by the International Institute for Educational Planning on the training of educational planners and administrators, July, 1973.

Mendoza, Argentina. Notes and selected documents on supervision supplied by the Sub-Secretaria de Educacion, Direccion de Planificacion Docente y Educativa, January, 1974.

Miklos, E. "Preparation Programs for Educational Administrators in Canada." Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, May 28-30, 1973.

National Institute of Education. Evaluative Criteria for Inspection and Supervision of Secondary Schools. New Delhi: National Council of Educational Research and Training, 1966.

National Staff College. General Information: National Staff College for Educational Planners and Administrators. New Delhi: National Staff College, 1971

New Brunswick, Province of. Schools Act and Regulations. (Consolidated to 1972). Amendment. (1973).

New Zealand. "Education in New Zealand." Wellington: Department of Education, Public Relations Section, September, 1972. (Mimeographed.)

New Zealand. Members Handbook, Secondary School Boards. Wellington: Department of Education, 1967.

New Zealand. Report of the Department of Education for the Period Ended 31 March 1973. Wellington: Government Printer, 1973.

New Zealand. "The Administration of Education in New Zealand." Wellington: Department of Education, Public Relations Section, September, 1973. (Mimeographed.)

Nigeria, Federal Republic of. An Introduction to the Administration, Organisation and Structure of Education in Nigeria. Lagos: Federal Ministry of Education, (n.d.)

Nova Scotia. Nova Scotia Summer School. 41st Session, 1973. Halifax: Department of Education, 1973.

Nova Scotia, Department of Education. Regulations Under the Education Act. (1973).

Ontario, Ministry of Education. "Principals' Course, Summer of '72, University of Waterloo." (Mimeographed.)

Ontario. The Schools Administration Act. (1971).

Ontario, Ministry of Education. Regulation: Supervisory Officer's Certificate. (1973).

Organization of American States. La Administracion de la Educacion en America Latina. Washington: Organization of American States, 1972.

Paraguay, Republic of. "Estudio Sobre la Formacion de Administradores y Supervisores Escolares." Ministerio de Educacion y Culto, Departmento de Ensenanza Primaria, Departmento de Ensenanza Secundaria, Departamento de Centros Regionales de Educacion, 1973. (Mimeographed.)

Prakasha, Veda. "Educational Administration in Asia: A General Survey." Background paper for the Advanced Training Seminar on Educational Planning and Management, n.d. (Mimeographed.)

Prakasha, Veda. "Shifting Emphasis in Education from Planning to Implementation." Paper prepared for participants in the Advanced Training Seminar in Educational Planning and Management, October 30 to December 2, 1972, New Delhi, India.

Prakasha, Veda. "Some Observations on the Training of Personnel for Educational Planning Machinery." Paper prepared for participants in the Seminar on Educational Planning Machinery in the Arab States, September 8-18, 1969, Beirut, Lebanon.

Pratumnopharat, Tirawuth. "The Principals' In-Service Program in Thailand." Edmonton: Department of Educational Administration, the University of Alberta, 1974. (Mimeographed.)

Québec, Ministère de L'Éducation. *Le Personnel de Cadre*. Document Numero 2. (1972).

Québec, Ministère de L'Éducation. *Les Directeurs Généraux et les Directeurs Généraux Adjoints des Commissions Scolaires et des Commissions Régionales*. Document Numero 3. (1972).

Québec, Ministère de L'Éducation. *Les Regles Administratives 1973/74* (Concernant la Détermination des Effectifs en Personnel Hors-Cadre, en Personnel de Cadre et en Personnel de Gérance) *des Commissions Scolaires et des Commissions Régionales*. Document Numero 8. (1973).

Québec, Ministère de L'Éducation. *Les Règles Administratives 1973/74 des Écoles Secondaires*. Document Numero 11. (1973).

Reller, Theodore L., and Edgar L. Morphet (eds.). *Comparative Educational Administration*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962.

Sanga, Michael. "The Concept of Education for Self-Reliance: Its Implementation in Tanzania." Edmonton: Department of Educational Administration, the University of Alberta, 1973. (Mimeographed.)

Saskatchewan, Department of Education. *Manual of Administration*. (1969).

Simon, Kenneth A., and W. Vance Grant. *Digest of Educational Statistics*. 1972 Edition. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

Singapore. "Administrators, Supervisors, Teachers and Pupils in Schools and Institutes." Information supplied by the Ministry of Education, March, 1974.

Singapore. *Education in Singapore*. Second Edition. Spingapore: Ministry of Education, 1972.

Sroypan, Sripapha. "Some Comparison of Administrative Structures: Japan and Thailand." Edmonton: Department of Educational Administration, the University of Alberta, 1973. (Mimeographed.)

State Institute of Education. *Report of the First Orientation Seminar for Inspecting Officers and Teacher Educators*. Publication No. 3 Madras: State Institute of Education, 1966.

Stiensape, Saisawarth. "Administrative Organization of Education in Thailand." Edmonton: Department of Educational Administration, the University of Alberta, 1974. (Mimeographed.)

Thomas, E. Barrington. "The Preparation of Educational Administrators in Papua New Guinea," *CCEA Newsletter*, No. 6 (November, 1973), 5-11.

Toh, Swee-Hin. "Education for Social Justice in West Malaysia." Edmonton: Department of Educational Administration, the University of Alberta, 1973. (Mimeographed.)

Tyoden, Jacob D. "Educational Administration in Benue-Plateau State of Nigeria." Edmonton: Department of Educational Administration, the University of Alberta, 1973. (Mimeographed.)

UCEA. *The Preparation and Certification of Educational Administrators: A UCEA Commission Report*. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1973.

Unesco. "A Latin American Experience in the Field of Training of Educational Planners and Administrators." Paper prepared for participants in the Seminar on "The Training of Specialists in Educational Administration and Planning: Evaluation and Prospects," Paris, July 2-11, 1973.

Warren, P. J. "The Search for Administrative Talent: Recruitment and Selection of Candidates." Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, May 28-30, 1973.

Woellner, Elizabeth H., and M. Aurilla Wood. *Requirements for Certification*. Thirty-sixth Edition 1971-72. Chicago: the University of Chicago Press, 1971

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON ADMINISTRATOR PREPARATION

Asian Institute of Educational Planning and Administration. *Modern Management Techniques in Educational Administration*. New Delhi: Asian Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, 1971.

Baron, George, Dan H. Cooper, and William G. Walker. *Educational Administration: International Perspectives*. New York: Rand-McNally, 1969.

Bessent, Wailand, and Philip K. Piele. *The Use of Computers in Administrator Preparation*. ERIC/CEM-UCEA Series on Administrator Preparation, Number Seven. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1973.

Bolton, Dale L. (ed.). *The Use of Simulation in Educational Administration*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1970.

Bruno, James E., and James N. Fox. *Quantitative Analysis in Educational Administrator Preparation Programs*. ERIC/CEM-UCEA Series on Administrator Preparation, Number Six. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1973.

Campbell, Roald F., and L. Jackson Newell. *A Study of Professors of Educational Administration*. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1973.

Cronin, Joseph M., and Peter P. Horoschak. *Innovative Strategies in Field Experiences for Preparing Educational Administrators*. ERIC/CEM-UCEA Series on Administrator Preparation, Number Eight. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1973.

Culbertson, Jack A., and Stephen P. Hencley (eds.). *Preparing Administrators: New Perspectives*. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1962.

Culbertson, Jack, and others (eds.). *Social Science Content for Preparing Educational Leaders*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1973.

Cunningham, K. S., and W. C. Radford. *Training the Administrator: A Study with Special Reference to Education*. Hawthorn: Australian Council for Educational Research, 1963.

Downey, Lawrence W., and Frederick Enns (eds.). *The Social Sciences and Educational Administration*. Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1963.

Farquhar, Robin H. *The Humanities in Preparing Educational Administrators*. State-of-the-Knowledge Series, Number Seven. Eugene: the ERIC clearinghouse on Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1970.

Farquhar, Robin H., and Philip K. Piele. *Preparing Educational Leaders: A Review of Recent Literature*. ERIC/CEM - UCEA Series on Administrator Preparation, Number One. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1972.

Hencley, Stephen P. (ed.). *The Internship in Administrative Preparation*. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1963.

Leu, Donald J., and Herbert C. Rudman (eds.). *Preparation Programs for School Administrators: Common and Specialized Learnings*. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1963.

Lutz, Frank W., and Reynolds Ferrante. *Emergent Practices in the Continuing Education of School Administrators*. ERIC/CEM - UCEA Series on Administrator Preparation. Columbus Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1972.

Lynch, Patrick D. (ed.). *Continuing Education for School Administrators*. Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico, 1966.

Miklos, Erwin. *Training-in-Common for Educational, Public, and Business* Administrators. ERIC/CEM - UCEA Series on Administrator Preparation, Number Four. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1972.

Stout, Robert T. *New Approaches to Recruitment and Selection of Educational Administrators*. ERIC/CEM - UCEA Series on Administrator Preparation, Number Five. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1973.

Walker, W. G. (ed.). *School, College and University: The Administration of Education in Australia*. St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1972.

Willower, Donald J., and Jack Culbertson (eds.). *The Professorship in Educational Administration*. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1964.

Wynn, Richard. *Unconventional Methods and Materials for Preparing Educational Administrators*. ERIC/CEM Series on Administrator Preparation, Number Two. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1972.